Mr Hawker 1363 k 6

THE

APOLOGY

OF

BENJAMIN BEN MORDECAI

TO HIS FRIENDS,

FOR EMBRACING CHRISTIANITY;

IN SEVEN LETTERS

To *ELISHA LEVI*, Merchant, of *Amsterdam*.

WITH

NOTES and ILLUSTRATIONS,

By the AUTHOR and the EDITOR.

LETTER I.

Existimabam, pro Veritate non nisi Veritate certandum; & quidem tali, qualem animo approbarem: frustra enim daturum me operam ut persuaderem aliis, quæ non mihi persuasissem.

GROT. de Ver.

Ἐγὼ μὲν ὧν περὶ τούτων ὡς ἔγνων, ἔτως ἔγραψα· εἰ δέ τις ἄλλως δοξάζειν βελήσεται περὶ αὐτῶν, ἀνέγκλητον ἐχέτω τὴν ἑτερογνωμοσύνην.

JOSEPHI Antiq. Lib. I. x. ad fin.

LONDON:

Printed for J. WILKIE, at N° 71, in St. *Paul's Church-Yard*,

M.DCC.LXXI.

BRITISH MUSEUM

TO THE

READER.

THE Editor of these Papers hath long observed; that the Christian world is halting between two very *opposite* Opinions, with regard to the *Nature* of *Christ*: some believing him to be the *supreme God*; which is inconsistent with the belief of his *Sufferings* and *Death*: and others believing that he had no Existence, before his Birth of the Virgin *Mary*; which is inconsistent with the belief of his Humiliation, and descent from Heaven to be made Flesh. These opinions therefore being both of them irreconcil'able with the Scriptures; the Editor humbly conceives, it may be of service to the Christian Cause to lay before the world a *Third* opinion; which appears to have been held by the most ancient Fathers of the Christian Church, and espoused by almost all the commentators upon the Old and New Testament; and seems not only to be free from the numberless difficulties, in which the opinions above-mentioned are involved; but explanes a much greater number of Texts than either of them, relating to the Scheme of Mediation

and Redemption; so-as to form one plane and rational System of Revelation, from the beginning to the end of Time; consistent with the Nature and Attributes of God, and the common Notions and Principles of Mankind.

The Editor thinks it proper farther to acquaint the candid Reader; that although the Apologist, for want of the advantage of a good Library, has been obliged very often to take his quotations at second hand: yet he believes and hopes, there is no reason to doubt of their Exactness; if there be any Credit to be given to the best characters in the learned world, upon whose authority he has ventured to quote them.

If this Letter should be receiv'd by the Public with approbation, the remaining Six will very soon follow: together with an Essay on the *Grand Apostasy*; which, as the Author observes, p. 79, was objected to Him, as an argument against the Christian Religion: and also a Letter to him, containing the Examination of the several opinions among Christians concerning the Generation of *Jesus Christ*; by *Khaled Ebn Abdallah*, a Mohammedan Dervise: referred-to in the 55th page of the first Letter. All which are now in the Editor's possession.

CON-

CONTENTS

OF THE

LETTER AND NOTES.

INTRODUCTION — — — Page 1
Christians unjustly accused of Polytheism — — 2
Whence that notion arose — — — — 5
The fatal effects of Division among Christians — — 6
Their variety of Systems, to preserve the Unity — — 10, 11
Who the person is, that is called *Christ* — — 12
The division of the whole subject — — — 13
The opinion of the *Sabellians* — — — — 14
——— the *Socinians* — — — — 16
——— the *Arians* — — — — 19
——— the *Orthodox* — — — — 24
Orthodoxy of the Church different, in different Ages — ib.
The progress of Orthodoxy — — — — I. 29
Orthodoxy of the first ages after the Apostles — — II. ib.
——— of the *Platonic* Christians — — III. ib.
——— at *Nice* — — — — 31
——— of *Cyril*, &c. — — — — 33
——— of the Council of *Lateran* — — V. 35
Difference of *Nominals* and *Realists* — — VI. 36
——— of *Realists* among themselves — — VII. 38
Opinion of Dr. *Waterland* and the *Pseudo-Athanasians* — VIII. 41
These opinions examined — — — — IX. 45
Person what — — — — — X. ib.
If the Son and Holy Ghost are *supreme*, they are *self-existent* XI. 46
If three *supreme*, then three *Gods* — — — ib.
Christ not supreme God, as to his Person — — XIII. 47

The

The *Pseudo-Athanasians* worship a Creature — — Page 48
If Christ be supreme God, he could not suffer — — 49
Whether Christ be two Natures, God and Man — — 50
This doctrine heretical — — — — — 51
Scripture sense of the word *Man* — — — 52
Opinion of *Apollinaris* — — — — 53
Of the words *Soul* and *Spirit* — — — — 55
Opinion of *Irenæus* — — — — — 57
The whole Christ suffered — — — — ib.
Bishop *Pearson*'s opinion, inconsistent with Revelation — 61
Dr. *Waterland*'s opinion, inconsistent with natural Religion - 69
Opinion of the *Scripturarians* concerning the Trinity — 73
Conclusions from the whole — — — — — 75
The doctrine of the Trinity, no objection to Christianity — ib.
Scripture the only rule of Faith — — — — 77
The apostasy and wickedness of the Christians, no objection to Christianity — — — — — 79

NOTES.

Note I. *SEPHER Ikkarim* quoted — — Page 81
II. The *Christians* hold only One God — — ib.
III. The *Jews* depend on the *Talmud* traditions — ib.
IV. The *Christians* never were agreed in the sense of the Propositions they disputed about — — — 82
V. Of the word *Creature* — — — — 86
VI. Of the words *Eternal*, &c. — — — — 87
VII. Of the *Generation* of the Son of God — — 90
VIII. Of the Trinity of one singular Essence — — 90
IX. Of the *Arians* — — — — — 92
X. Favourers of the *Arians* — — — — 101
XI. *Daillé* concerning the difficulty of finding the Truth in the Writings of the Fathers — — 103
XII. *Papists* deny, that the Trinity can be proved from Scripture or the Ancients — — — 104
XIII. The

XIII. The Fathers, who held a Generation of the world *in tempore* — — — — Page 104
XIV. The Fathers, who held Christ to be the Angel of the Covenant — — — — — ib.
XV. *Episcopius* quoted, concerning the *Nicene* Creed -
XVI. Of the Schole of *Alexandria* — — — — 105
XVII. The Son believed equal to the Father in Essence only — — — — — 114
XVIII. Of *Apollinaris* — — — — ib.
XIX. *Bernard Gilpin* quoted, concerning Bishop *Tunstall*
XX. Of the Council of *Lateran* — — — — ib.
XXI. The five Trinities mentioned in the Unitarian Tracts — — — — 120
XXII. The Trinity of St. *Augustine* and the Reformed Churches — — — — — 121
XXIII. *Eusebius* and *Eustathius* accuse one another — 122
XXIV. *Chillingworth* quoted, concerning *Substance* — ib.
XXV. *Hilary* quoted, concerning the *Passion* of Christ - ib.
XXVI. *Ignatius*, &c. quoted, for the opinion of *Apollinaris* 123
XXVII. *Cunæus* quoted, concerning the *Jews'* care of the Bible — — — — — ib.
XXVIII. *Maimonides's* description of the Unity of God — ib.
XXIX. Of the *Athanasian* Creed — — — — ib.
XXX. Of the *Hebrew* word יחיד — — — 126
XXXI. Of the Unity — — — — — ib.

ERRATA.

ERRATA.

PAGE 2, line 12, read *nation*. L. 30, put a *Full stop* at *Old*, dele the following marks of a quotation, and read, *We ourselves——Godhead* a *and both of us*, Jews *and* Moors, *accord*——*Christians*; *whom We*—— *conceit, as Dr.* Addison *expresses it*; *that They*——. P. 5, l. 23, read *We*.—P. 6, l. 28, dele *who*, and read *I call them both Heretics*; *because they were both condemned by Councils*.—P. 8. l. 3, 4, for *imperial* read *episcopal*. L. 9, 10, read, *No wild Beasts are so furious against Men*; *as the generality of Christians are against one another*. L. 15, after *Philosophy*; read, *and taught*. L. 18, read *wealthy and grown*. L. 33, for *take*, read *tear*. P. 9, l. 7, read, *whose Communion extended*.—P. 10, l. 4, after *accusation*; read, *on the contrary, he will plainly see*; —P. 11, l. 3, for *and*, read *in one*. L. 23, read *imputed*.—P. 14, l. 19, read *the same person*.—P. 15, l. 2, after *Basil*, add, (*as quoted by* Sandius). L. 5, dele *the Substance of*, and the *Comma* after *Father*. L. 6, put *Acts* in a Parenthesis. L. 7, dele *to be*, and read *begotten*. L. *ult.* at the reference put *Justin*, p. 460.—P. 16, l. 27, read *Theodosians*.—P. 17, l. 22, for *exist*, read *consist*. L. *antepenult.* for *they*, read *the* Socinians.—P. 18, l. 1, for *them*, read *it*. L. 33, put a *Semicolon* after *this*; and a *Comma* after *Jesus*, and *God*, and read *in Himself*. L. 34, read *the Man*. L. *penult.* at ', read *Dawson*, p. 84.—P. 19, l. 4, after *Christ*, add *that Socinus did*: L. 10, read *But there is no doubt they* mean.—P. 20, l. 18, read *unum*. L. *penult.* for *Pope*, read *Bishop*.—P. 21, l. 33, for *Rib.* read *Fabr. Bibl.*—P. 22, l. 13, for *risen*, read *arisen*.—P. 23, l. 9, put a *Colon* only at *taught*: and at *another*: l. 16. and at *Dominian*: l. 29.—P. 24, l. 5, read *who knows*. L. 19, read 556.—P. 25, l. *ult.* for *nearly*, read *really*. —P. 28, l. 10, for *age*, read *time*; and, l. 10, 11, put within brackets [*the Fathers of the three first ages*]. L. 11, read *the purity of the Faith of the Church*. L. 12, for *It*, read *These*. L. *penult.* for *do*, read *do*. L. *ult.* read 275. —P. 29, l. 8, read *next*; *the*. L. *penult.* read *Scriptures*'. L. *ult.* read *Orig. Sanc.* 349.—P. 32, l. 24, after *agast it*, put the mark of reference *. L. 30, for ' read ;—P. 32, l. 23, read *Note XVI.*—P. 33, l. *ult.* add *Note XXIX.* —P. 35, l. 6, after *and*, put a *Bracket*. L. 24, for *on*, read *or*. L. 30, for *and*, read *call'd the*.—P. 36, l. *ult.* Note ', read *Notes XX. and XXXII.*—P. 37, l. *penult.* ', read, *Pol.* iv. *Tract* ii. *p.* 3.—P. 38, l. 13, after 605, add *See Note XXII.*—P. 39, l. *ult.* add *Note XXIII.*—P. 40, l. 24, after *unequal Minds*, add *and so called* Arian; L. 32, read *a Father*. L. *ult.* for *way*, read *where*; and for *Solution*, read *Situation*; and to the Note in the following page add *p.* 18.—P. 42, l. 27, read *of Credulity and Incredulity*.—P. 43, l. *ult.* for *Note XX.* read *Def. p.* 379, 380, 381.—P. 44, l. *ult.* for *XXVII.* read *XXIX.*—P. 45, l. *ult.* read *Note XXIV.*—P. 47, l. 13, for *of*, read *or*. L. 24, read *which they do*; and l. 25, *which it is said*.—P. 48, l. 28, for *as*, read *who*.—P. 49, l. 27, read *Psalm.*—P. 54, l. 5, read *Metatron*. L. *ult.* for *XXXIII.* read *XXVI.*—P. 55, l. 12, read *and* Sandii. —P. 56, l. 2, read *cited by* Sand. L. 8, for *men amongst them*, read *Christians*.—P. 57, l. 8, read *Paul, says he*. —P. 58, l. 9, put a *Full stop* after *words*.—P. 66, l. 5, put a *Full stop* after *Man*. L. 12, read *Father*. L. 18, read *spill'd*.—P. 70, l. 1, read *precarious*.—P. 72, l. 28, read *Reasons*.—P. 75, l. 12, put a *Comma* after *nothing*. L. 20, read *Barbarism*. L. 23, put a letter of reference ; and answering to it, at the bottom, *Unitas. Tract, vol. I. p.* 17. *of the last Tract*. Luther. *postill. major.* Dominic. Calvin. *Admon.* 1. *ad* Polonos.—P. 76, l. 29, for *This*, read *it*. —P. 78, l. 34, read *age whatever*.—P. 82, l. 17, for *this*, read *thus*.—P. 83, l. 13, for *Mr.* Bennet, read *Mr.* B. Bennet. L. 26, after *Essence*, add *in* Notion *only*; and l. 27, after *distinctions*, read *but* really *distinguished from one another*.—P. 85, l. 29, 30, put *after the Resurrection*, after *Wills*. L. 37, read *Heretics*:"—P. 89, l. 30, and 31, read "*St.* Paul *and He*. L. 42, after *Const.* add, *Bibl. Univ. X.* 445.—P. 90, l. 2, dele *fore the*.—P. 92, l. 21, read γενησεται.—P. 93, l. 33, read ἐμοὶ δὲ.—P. 96, l. 22, read 45. Line 31, 32, dele ( ).—P. 97, l. 11, for *and in the mean time*, read *while*. Line 15, read *that, before the Council of* Nice, *those*. L. 16, for *or*, read *nor*. L. 20, read *afterwards against* Macedonius *by that of*.—P. 100, l. 12, 13, for *Constantine and Athanasius*, read *the* Athanasians. L. *antepenult.* read [c] *Bishop* Burnet's *Animadv. on Mr.* Hill, *p.*—P. 101, l. 26, for *Note IX.* read *p.* 19. L. 37, read *tom. v. p.* 3. *of the fifth tract*.—P. 103, l. 21, for *sect.* 11. read ii. L. *antepenult.* for *be*, read *Mr.* Daillé.—P. 104, l. *ult.* read *æmulatione*.—P. 106, l. 7, for *I. i.* 1. read *John* i. 1; and, l. 18, for 620, read 623; and, l. 39, *Hottinger*.—P. 108, l. 33, for 446, read 443.—P. 111, l. 12, read *Morney*.

LET-

LETTER THE FIRST.

Quo magis introspicio, eo magis verum comperio; eos, qui περὶ τὰς τριάδος volunt supra τὰ ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς πεῖρεν sapere, panas dare τῆς ἀνοησοφροσύνης. Hugo Grotius ad fratrem Gulielmum Epistola 152, p. 798.

YOU will not be surprised, my dear Friend, to hear, that I, who have passed through so many countries, and always fearlessly engaged in religious disputes with the inhabitants, should still continue my old practice: But to be informed, as I find you have been; that I am upon the point of giving-up, or perhaps that I have already given up, that religion in which I was educated, and which I have so long and so warmly defended, and joined with the Tritheists; may be an occasion of much wonder to you: and indeed, if it were fact, would be no less so to myself. —— "Who could imagine," you might say; "after our many debates with the two Christian "priests at *Marseilles*, upon the subject of the Unity, in defense of "*Khaled* the Mahometan; that you should be so soon reconciled to "the doctrines, you opposed so strongly?" Indeed, my good Friend, I am not so far gone as you suspect; and would by no means have you believe me so unsettled in my principles, as common fame may report me to be; or so weak, as to have altered my opinion; with regard to those essential points, which we then discoursed upon. The God of *Israel* forbid, that I should ever depart from the faith of our great Founder; and especially, in that most fundamental of all principles, (which *Maimonides* calls *Fundamentum fundamentorum*;) in which we were so carefully and fully instructed by our worthy Tutor *Moses Cofrain*; the Unity of *Jehovah*. No! there is nothing, I hope, in this world; that can move me from this belief: neither pain, nor poverty, nor death.

As to the Arguments, which were then uſed againſt us by the *Capuchin* and *Jeſuit*; they neither made any impreſſion upon me at that time, nor ſince: but rather confirmed me more ſtrongly in the truth. For what did they attempt to prove? but merely the old ſtory, that they had ſo often objected to us; that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, were each of them the ſupreme God; and yet were not three ſupreme Gods, but one and the ſame ſupreme God? Which, when it came to be explained, appeared to be nothing more than the ancient Hereſy of *Sabellius*: That the three perſons in the Trinity were only three different modes of exiſtence, under which the one ſupreme God was ſuppoſed to act: which opinion, though it does by no means contradict our notions of the Unity of God; yet, as I then argued, and ſtill think, it entirely deſtroys the notion of a Trinity; by denying the perſonal, that is, the actual, exiſtence both of the Son and Spirit. For a Trinity of Perſons can no more be conſtituted, by the Father's acting under the three different characters of Father, Son, and Spirit; than by acting under the three different characters of Creator, Preſerver, and Benefactor. And this it was that gave me the firſt ſuſpicion, that the Chriſtians were not Polytheiſts; as they had always been repreſented to me: for I thought it impoſſible, that they ſhould believe the exiſtence of three Gods; and yet give up the Perſonality, that is, the perſonal exiſtence, of their Founder and Redeemer; rather than admit of two.

It is this opinion, *viz.* That the Chriſtians believe a Trinity of Gods, and thereby maintain a doctrine contrary to the Unity of *Jehovah*; which hath ſo long prevented the ſons of *Iſhmael*, as well as *Iſrael*, from examining with any patience into their religious principles. *Mahomet* ſays, in the 5th chapter of the *Koran*: "It is long "ſince the Infidels have ſaid, there are three Gods: certainly there "is but one God. And We ourſelves explain the ſecond article of *Sepher* "*Ikkarim*[a], to pull-down the Chriſtians' Faith in the Trinity; main- "taining it to be an aſſertion of a triple Godhead: and both the Jews "and Moors accord in exploding it, as a hypochondriacal imagination "of the Chriſtians; whom they accuſe of Polytheiſm, out of an "ignorant conceit, that they imagine every perſon of the bleſſed "Trinity, a diſtinct Deity[b]:" So that if the perſuaſion, that the Meſſiah was to be a temporal Prince; did, as the Chriſtians ſay, prevent our Fathers from believing in him at his firſt appearance: the

[a] Note I. [b] See Note II.

current

current opinion at preſent, that the Chriſtian religion ſuppoſes him to be a ſupreme ſelf-exiſting God, perſonally diſtinct and different from the Lord *Jehovah*, which is a direct contradiction to the whole Revelation given to our Fathers; is as great an obſtacle to our believing in him now: and has for many ages prevented Chriſtianity from making any farther progreſs in the world.

I own to you, when I firſt looked into the Chriſtian writings at *Liſbon*; it was without the leſt expectation of meeting with any truth, that could be of ſervice to me: it was rather from a deſire of knowing upon what principles their ſtrange opinion of three Gods was founded; that I might be able more effectually to hold-up an argument againſt them, and defend the Unity of *Jehovah*. But the caſe was much altered, when I came to talk with the *Engliſh* Proteſtants; whom I found to be much more free and generous in their way of thinking, than any other Chriſtians I had ever converſed with: and, except in the ſingle article of the Unity, not only very ready to hear reaſon; but to anſwer it alſo in a rational manner. This candid behaviour gave me a better opinion of Chriſtianity in general, than I ever had before; and drew me on by degrees to conſider its doctrines, and particularly their doctrine of the Trinity, more minutely and accurately, than I at firſt apprehended to be neceſſary: for I could not think, that any people would ſuffer their religion to be fairly examined into by reaſon; if it had not ſomething plauſible in it at leſt, if not defenſible: and my curioſity was raiſed the higher, becauſe I had never heard any thing of it before, but what was mere bigotry and contradiction.

Now as the grand point I have always had in view to inculcate, is the Unity of *Jehovah*; and upon this ſubject the people in *England* ſeemed to have very vague and uncertain notions; and very few of them appeared capable of giving me any plain and intelligible account of it; and thoſe, who were capable, were not willing to do it: I was at length reſolved to ſee, what their New Teſtament ſaid about it. And I was the more inclined to enter upon this ſtudy; becauſe I found it neceſſary for my health, to draw-off my thoughts from my misfortunes in the Earthquake; and find-out ſome amuſing employment for the many leiſure hours, which, ſince my receſs from buſineſs, began to lie heavy on my hands.

I have therefore ſeveral times read-over that very extraordinary book; which, even at the firſt reading, ſeemed to throw an amazing

light upon our prophecies; and to solve me many difficulties. But what moſt ſurpriſed me was, that I met with no appearance of Polytheiſm through the whole; except merely ſome figurative expreſſions, which manifeſtly ought to be otherwiſe interpreted; and, at the ſame time, as ſtrong aſſertions of the Unity, as any in our own Scripture; and ſuch a wonderful difference of doctrines, in numberleſs points, from what I expected; that I much queſtion, whether genuine Chriſtianity hath been more falſely repreſented by its open enemies, or its profeſſed friends. And if I were to receive no other improvement from my labour than this; I ſhould at leaſt learn to be more cautious for the future, how I indulge a prejudice againſt any ſet of people whatſoever; without firſt examining their ſentiments fairly, whether they actually profeſs the errors they are charged with by their adverſaries or no; and obſerve more carefully that excellent maxim, which you tell me is inſcribed upon the *Stadthouſe* at *Amſterdam*; AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM. In ſhort, the Chriſtianity I have met with among the Proteſtants in *England*, and in the New Teſtament, is as different from the Chriſtianity we found in *France* and *Portugal*, as Light from Darkneſs.

Now, if the Chriſtians themſelves have ſo ſtrangely miſrepreſented the doctrines of the New Teſtament by their traditions; how can we wonder, if our own Rabbins have given us, in their way, as imperfect and falſe an account of them? or that We, who are bred-up in prejudices againſt the Chriſtians from our youth, ſhould believe them to be Polytheiſts; merely becauſe we are told ſo? For we are afraid to ſee with our own eyes, or hear with our own ears; and implicitly believe all that the Maſters teach us: And while the world is growing wiſer in other things, and we improve upon our anceſtors in every art and ſcience; we have wilfully ſhut our eyes againſt all farther knowledge in divine truths, which are of the greateſt importance to us; and refuſe to receive them, though reveled by God himſelf; unleſs they be alſo derived to us, or confirmed, by the authority of a *Rabbin* or a *Sanhedrim*; and oftentimes in a very different ſenſe from that in which God reveled them: For who is there, among us all, that adheres to the Scripture alone; without the addition of *Talmud* traditions, and the interpretations of the Maſters?

I don't mention this, as a weakneſs peculiar to our nation; but rather as a general infatuation, and the greateſt obſtacle to truth that

[1] Note III.

can

can be imagined: For what can be more amazing, than to find the revelations of God ſo mixed and confounded with the inventions of Men; that nothing is more difficult than to ſeparate them? And this is not only the caſe with real revelations; but even pretended ones: The *Sonna*, or book of traditions, among the Mahometans, being looked upon, by many of them, to be of equal authority with the *Koran* itſelf, and conſidered as a teſt of orthodoxy; as the Talmud is with Us, the Council of *Trent* with the Romaniſts, and ſeveral Catechiſms, Confeſſions of Faith, Articles of Religion, and ſuch like human compoſitions, among the Proteſtants: For no ſooner are the learned Divines ſatisfied, that the revelation comes from God; than they all agree to ſubſtitute ſome human compoſition in the ſtead of it: and, when their Catechumens "aſk for an Egg, they give them a Scorpion; they aſk for Bread, and they receive a Stone."

What the learned Dr. *Cudworth* complains of in the Chriſtians, is equally true, *mutatis mutandis*, of all mankind: "Do we not open "and lock-up heaven now-a-days, with the private key of this or "that opinion of our ſeveral fanſies, as we pleaſe? and if any ob- "ſerve Chriſt's commandments never ſo ſincerely, and ſerve God "with faith and a pure conſcience, that yet haply ſkills not of ſome "contended-for opinions, ſome darling notions; he hath not the "right *Shibboleth*, he hath not the true Watch-word; he muſt not "paſs the guards of Heaven[a]." Thus We alſo extract our *Shibboleth* from the opinions of our favourite Doctors; by which the true Faith is to be tried and approved: We then go on farther, to examine and interpret the word of God by their authority; and make the Scripture itſelf bend and bow to it; and admit no doctrine, how plainly ſoever reveled, which contradicts it: and thus erect a Serpent for our adoration; which, though at firſt intended to ſerve good purpoſes, does at length lead us into Impiety. So certain it is; that nothing but divine truth can, for any length of time, ſupport divine truth. The moment we give way to human Authority, in the interpretation of Scripture; there is an end of all divine Faith: and we found our religion upon the opinions of weak and fallible men: And then all religions are ſo far upon an equal footing.

After this free and ingenuous confeſſion, you will probably aſk me; Whether I imagine our notion of Polytheiſm among the Chriſtians hath no foundation at all? and, if ſo, From whence had our

[a] Cudworth's Sermon on 1 John ii. 34.

Maſters this opinion? and how came the Mahometans to agree with them, that it is the fundamental error of Chriſtianity; and to declare the Unity of God to be the chief, or rather the only cauſe of *Mahomet*'s miſſion? The Chriſtians, ſays he, have fallen into Errors, corrupting this dogma of the *Unity* by the doctrine of the *Trinity*; and God, who would not leave the eſſential truths without teſtimony, ſent his Prophet *(Mahomet)* to re-eſtabliſh them[a]. I anſwer; the opinion did not take its riſe from the genuine doctrines of Chriſtianity: but from the diſputes among the Chriſtians, many centuries ago; and the unmanly heat and obloquy, with which they reflected upon one another.

And yet I think it is but juſtice to own; that their differences and diſputes did not procede at firſt from any bad cauſe, but from a very laudable one; from a zelous attachment to what they looked upon to be the *true faith*; while they were at a loſs to know what *that* was, from the want of a criterion to aſcertain and determine, when the words of Scripture ought to be underſtood in a *literal*, and when in a *figurative* ſenſe; when in a *more reſtrained*, and when in an *abſolute* one; and each party imagined the honour of God would be beſt promoted, and the Chriſtian religion beſt vindicated, by interpreting the doubtful texts according to their particular ſyſtems.

This uncertainty affects the hiſtory of the Fall of Man, the Sacrifice of Chriſt, the Euchariſt, the Millennium, the Locality of Hell, and the Nature of its Fire, the Generation of the Son of God, and many other ſubjects; but that which cauſed the greateſt diviſions and animoſities in the Chriſtian church, was the controverſy about the Trinity; under the two famous heretics of *Alexandria*, *Arius* and *Athanaſius*; who were both condemned by the Councils. And it was this diſpute that gave riſe to the prevailing opinion I am now ſpeaking of, both among us and the Mahometans; that the Chriſtians in general are Polytheiſts and Idolaters. This accuſation was firſt begun by the Chriſtians themſelves; by way of excuſe for the dreadful perſecutions they exerciſed againſt one another: which were followed, according to the juſt judgement of God, by the ruin of the Chriſtian churches in *Aſia*; and the introduction of Mahommediſm.

" If we look into the eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians, even from the third " century; we ſhall find the Chriſtian world to have then had a very " different aſpect from what ſome authors have repreſented: and ſo

[a] *Reland*'s Four treatiſes, p. 172.

" far

" far from being endued with active graces, zeal, and devotion, " and established within itself with purity of doctrine, union, " and firm profession of faith; that, on the contrary, by the ambi- " tion of the Clergy, &c. they lost the whole substance of their " religion f."

Dr. *Prideaux*, speaking of these disturbances, says of the Christians: " Having drawn the abstrusest niceties into controversy, " they did thereby so destroy peace, love, and charity, among them; " that they lost the whole substance of their religion; and in a man- " ner drove Christianity quite out of the world: So that the *Saracens*, " taking advantage of the weakness of power, and the distractions " of counsils, which these divisions had caused; soon over-ran with a " terrible devastation all the Eastern provinces of the Roman empire, " turned every where their Churches into Mosques, and their wor- " ship into a horrid superstition; and forced on them that abominable " imposture of Mahometism g."—— " The unhappy contests, which " in the fifth century divided the churches, particularly in the East; " occasioned damages, which Christianity will never be able to recover. " These sects," *viz.* of the *Nestorians* and *Eutychians*, " partly from " idleness and superstition, and partly from the particular grudge, " envy, and malice, of the ecclesiastics, gave the finishing stroke to " mutual forbearance in matters of religion. From that time there " was nothing to be seen in the East, but proscriptions, massacres, " and rage h."

Etherius i, a bishop of the fifth century, who was persecuted for *Nestorianism*, says; " I pass over in silence the chains, the prisons, " the confiscations, the marks of infamy, the massacres that call for " compassion; the enormity of which is such, that even those, who " had the misfortune to be witnesses of them, are scarce able to be- " lieve them to be true. All these tragedies are matters of sport to " the bishops; among whom want of bowels passes for courage: they " call their cruelty, zeal; and they honour their cheats and impos- " tures with the name of wisdom. In this unhappy age, monaste- " ries endured sieges; they came to blows in councils; they entered " into the churches with arms; they treated with the utmost cruelty " all those, that were suspected of favouring opinions which scarce

f Sale's Koran, 33. Treatises, p. 165 to 169.

g Prideaux's Life of Mahomet.

h Reland's Four

i *Etherius Tyanorum episcopus, inter opera Theodoreti.* Tom. v. p. 688.

" any

"any body understood[k]; not even those, who defended them with "the greatest obstinacy and stiffness[l]." And their contests for preferment were carried to such a height at *Rome*, for the [illegible] by *Damasus* and *Ursicinus*; that there were no less than 137 killed in one day[m]. It was on account of these divisions and cruelties, which tore the church to pieces, that *Gratian* says; *Ut legit*, &c.; He that reads ecclesiastical history, what does he meet with but the vices of the Bishops[n]? And *Ammianus Marcellinus* says, the wild beasts are not so furious against [illegible]; as the generality of Christians[o]: "*Nullas infestas hominibus bestias, ut sunt sibi "feralis expertus*[p]." An instance or two of the fury and barbarity of those times will give a better notion of them, than to deal in generals.

The first shall be that of *Hypatia*, in the fifth century. She was a woman so famous for Learning, that she excelled in all Philosophy; taught in the schools (which *Plotinus* continued;) so that she had scholars out of many countries, and was oft with princes and rulers, and for her modesty was much esteemed. *Orestes*, the governor, often talking with her, the people said; it was by Her means that He was not reconciled to *Cyril*. They laid hold on her, drew her into a church, stripped her stark naked, rased the skin, and tore the flesh off her body with sharp shells, till she died. They quarter'd her body, and burn'd her to ashes[q].

The other instance shall be of *Proterius*, bishop of *Alexandria*; who, flying from the people's rage, got into the Baptistery, a place reverenced by the barbarians and the fiercest men; but these furious people, set-on by their bishop *Timothy*, (whom they had chosen) neither reverencing the place, the worship, the time, (which was *Easter*;) nor the office of priesthood, did strike the blameless man, and kill him cruelly, with six more; and dragging his wounded carcase every where, and cruelly drawing it about through almost all the parts of the city, did mercilessly beat the senseless corpse, and divided his parts, and spared not to [illegible] his entrails with their teeth, like dogs; and, casting the rest of his body into the fire, they scattered his ashes into the wind, transcending the fierceness of all beasts: and the architect of this was [their new bishop] *Timothy*[r].

[k] Note IV.
[l] Reland's Four Treatises.
[m] Sale's Koran, 33, 34.
[n] Ep. 22, p. 1.
[o] Lib. 22.
[p] Baxter's Church History, p. 85.
[q] See Binnius, 147, 151.—Baxter, 110.

In

In this state of confusion and madness among the Christians, *Arabia* became a secure retreat for those who were proscribed; and was peopled at the expense of the *Greek* Empire.

"It is certain, from Christian and *Arabian* authors, that, before "the Preaching of *Mahomet*, the Christian religion was known in "*Arabia*; several Tribes having embraced it. The *Nestorians*, on "one side, extended formerly all the way to *China*, through the "northern provinces of *Asia*; and the followers of *Eutyches* and "*Dioscurus*, spreading themselves in *Egypt*, *Armenia*, and *Mesopo-*"*tamia*, brought over the whole kingdom of the *Abyssines*; and the "whole kingdom of the *Homerites*, in the south of *Arabia*, had "embraced it. Nevertheless, in a short time, we saw all these un-"happy nations embrace Mahometism. To what can we attribute "so rapid and general a revolution, and such success to an im-"posture; but to the Scandal occasioned by the fatal divisions of "Christians, and the proscriptions and massacres practised upon "one another?"[1]

The direct answer therefore to the question, How it came to pass, that the Christians have still been looked upon, by Us and the Mahometans, as Polytheists and Idolaters; is this: that it came from their own intemperate zele, in persecuting one another under such denominations; whilst, in the true diabolical spirit of controversy, each sect among them drew what inferences it pleased from the doctrines of its adversaries; and then fixed those inferences upon Them, as the opinions and doctrines which they taught. Thus Archbishop *Tenison* tells us, with regard to *Arius*; "*Arius*, the *Libyan*, "a priest of *Alexandria*, is accused by the Fathers both as a Heretic "and an Idolater; and his idolatry is charged upon him as the just "consequence of his heretical opinion."[2] So that it was from these *supposed* consequences, and not from any of the *direct and avowed* doctrines which any one sect among the Christians ever owned, and maintained; that they accused one another of that Idolatry and Polytheism, which they all equally disclamed; and looked upon to be the greatest calumny and injustice to be charged with: the natural consequence of which most justly returned upon themselves, in that their enemies very readily received their testimony against one another; and believed every thing that was had against them all in general.

[1] Reland, p. 165 to 169.

[2] Tenison on Idolatry, p. 158.

But an impartial man, who is not biaſſed by the prejudices of former times, and is willing to give every man leave to declare and explane his own ſentiments; cannot eaſily believe ſuch an accuſation: but on the contrary will plainly ſee, that the various interpretations of the texts relating to this ſubject, and the ſeveral hereſies that have been introduced about it, had all of them this one point in view; how to *avoid* thoſe very doctrines of which they are accuſed: and accordingly it is confeſſed by *Irenæus*, concerning moſt of them; "that the maintainers of them do ac-"knowledge one God: however their notions of him might be "corrupted[a]." And it was merely becauſe they could not receive ſo impious a doctrine, as the ſufferings and death of the inviſible *Jehovah*, the God of the univerſe, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς, the ſupreme, ſelf-exiſtent God; that ſo many extravagant opinions have been invented to evade it.

The *Baſilidians*, in the very beginning of Chriſtianity, denied that Chriſt himſelf ſuffered; but ſaid, *Simon* the *Cyrenian* ſuffered in his place: (*Irenæ.* l. 1. c. 23. *Epiph. Hær.* 24. num. 3.) and the *Cerinthians* before them, and the *Carpocratians* next, (to name no more of thoſe who affirmed *Jeſus* to have been a mere man;) did believe the ſame thing. *Photius* quotes, from a book called the Journeys of the Apoſtles; that He was not crucified, but an other in his ſtead.—Some thought it was a ſpy, who came to intrap him; others, that it was *Titian*, who was directed by *Judas* to kill him; and in the forged Epiſtle of *Barnabas*, it is ſaid to have been *Judas* himſelf, who appeared like him; and others ſay, that his Manhood only ſuffered; and that his Godhead aſcended into Heaven. *Sale's Koran*, p. 42 and 79. The laſt of theſe notions is pretty much the ſame with that which is now held by many, though differently expreſſed; *viz.* that Chriſt ſuffered only in his Human nature; the Divine nature being impaſſible.

Thus the Divinity of Chriſt was given-up by ſome; and his Death and Suffering by others. Chriſt was divided into *two* Chriſts; and the Chriſt that ſuffered, ſuppoſed to be different from the Chriſt that came down from Heaven; though the New Teſtament never ſpeaks of more than one. But, notwithſtanding ſuch differences, there is not the leſt pretenſe to ſay, as the Chriſtians in power generally do upon ſuch occaſions; that any of theſe opinions were taken

[a] Irenæus, l. 1. c. 19. p. 114.

up,

up, out of a vain desire of appearing singular; or retained, out of an obstinacy of temper; for, in truth, they were forced into them, in order to reconcile Scripture with Scripture; to preserve, as they thought, the honour of Christ; and maintain, at all events, the grand point they all had in view; to wit, the honour and dignity of the one God: for, how inconsistent soever they have been in other matters, none of them have ever given-up this; but unanimously professed, "That the Lord our God is ONE; the origin, the "cause, the author, the root, the fountain, the head, of the Son, "and the whole Divinity; according to the numerous testimonies "of the ancient doctors of the church [t]."

But if these warm antagonists had been actually guilty of the Idolatry and Polytheism they impute to each other; surely we have no right to condemn Christianity itself, upon that account: unless we can shew, that It favours such opinions and practises.——Some affirm of Christ, that he was created; and *there was* (a time, or duration), when he was not; Others, that he existed from eternity [u]. —Some say, that he was begotten of the Father by a *Necessity* of *Nature*; Others anathematise them for that opinion, and declare; that he was begotten by the *Will* of the *Father*.—Some assert, that he was not a Son, till he was begotten of the Virgin *Mary*; Others, that he was begotten twice before the Creation, and a third time at his Incarnation [x]; Others, that he is eternally generating and generated; as Light from the Sun.—Some believe, he continued to be the identical and numerical substance of the Father, after he was begotten; and Others, that the words υἱὸς γεννηθεὶς, and ἐκ πατρὸς, imply a disjunction from the Father's substance; and a separate existence *per se*.—In these, and a thousand other metaphysical difficulties, the Christians have involved themselves; by deserting the express words of Scripture, and pushing their own interpretations farther than God has reveled; and by restraining the word of God from its primitive latitude, in which Christ and the Apostles left it, have formed particular sects and parties in religion, and made divisions in the church, according to these human and uncertain interpretations; and anathematised all such, as would not submit to them. But, whatever has been the doctrine of *particular* churches, in consequence of this "profane and sacrilegious impiety;" the *universal* church of Christ allows of no such mixture of divine and

[t] Pearson on the Creed, p. 37, 38. Lond. 1741. [u] Note V. [x] Note VI. [y] Note VII.

human placits; being open to all that believe the Scriptures: and a man may be a good Chriſtian, and a member of the Church Catholic; that has never been admitted into any particular viſible church at all, nor ever examined into the metaphyſical nature of the divine ſubſtances. The truth of Chriſtianity is therefore by no means concerned in the ſolution of theſe or any other ſuch like queſtions: on the contrary, it is from ſuch curious and unprofitable enquiries into the metaphyſical nature of the Son of God, that the chief difficulties in Chriſtianity have ariſen; ſo that moſt of the Chriſtians I have met with are at a loſs to inform me in the very firſt principle of their religion; who the perſon really is, whom they call by the name of Chriſt; and ſometimes declare to have ſuffered for mankind, and, at other times, to be impaſſible; i.e. incapable of ſuffering.

It is upon account of this fundamental article, *viz.* that the Meſſiah ſuffered according to the Scriptures; which ſeems to be contradicted by the Chriſtian Philoſophers, in ſuppoſing him incapable of ſuffering; that I find myſelf obliged in this apology to enter into ſuch kind of diſputes, with regard to which the New Teſtament is ſilent. Becauſe, if the Chriſtians have actually proved, or are able to prove, that Chriſt was incapable of ſuffering; it muſt neceſſarily follow, that he did not ſuffer; and if he did not ſuffer, he was not the Meſſiah, foretold by *Iſaiah* and *Daniel*; and if he did not anſwer to the deſcription of the Meſſiah, which is given by our Prophets; he was not the Meſſiah we expected.

And yet the Chriſtians tell us; (and our own Scriptures, as well as theirs, ſeem to authoriſe their aſſertion;) that our Diſperſion will certainly continue, till we become one with them; and receive their Meſſiah as our King, who is to reign over all.—And, if this be the caſe, when ſhall we ſee the end of our miſeries? Muſt we ſtay, till the Chriſtians are ſo enlightened as to be all of one mind, and teach us the ſame rational and conſiſtent doctrines? Or ſhall we kindly lend them our aſſiſtence; and from the ſtile and language, and ſenſe of *our* Scriptures, which they allow to be of divine authority, endeavour to explane to them the true ſenſe and meaning of *their own*? This would certainly be a more acceptable labour to them, than they have received from their own brethren of late years; who have been employed for ſome time in pulling down the errors that were built up in the days of darkneſs and ignorance, and removing the old rubbiſh; but have hitherto erected nothing themſelves ſubſtantial in the ſtead: which has frequently

prevented

prevented the Christians in general from distinguishing their Friends from their Enemies.

The first thing therefore, which I shall undertake to do in these papers, (wherein I mean to lay before you an apology for my present sentiments,) shall be to consider; who the person is, whom the Christians call by the name of Christ.

Secondly, To shew; upon what grounds I am convinced that Jesus Christ is the Messiah, that was promised to the Jews; and,

Thirdly, To explane the Christian doctrine of Redemption and Salvation by Christ, agreably to the Old and New Testament; the nature and attributes of God, and the common notions and principles of Mankind.

And when I have informed you what my notions are, and by what reasons I support them; I doubt not but you will either agree with me, that our prophecies are completed; or point-out my errors to me with a friendly hand. Whichever be the event, I have no other end in this enquiry; than to understand in the true sense what God has been pleased to revele to us.

The first thing which I shall undertake to consider is this: Who the person is, whom the Christians call by the name of *Christ*; and under this head I shall briefly lay before you the chief of those many different hypotheses, which have been invented by ingenious men among the Christians; in order to account for the Person, Actions, and Character of Christ: and particularly how he can be said to have suffered Death, consistently with his being called by the name of God; and how he can be God, consistently with the Unity of the invisible *Jehovah*.

To solve these difficulties, the Christians have taken different ways: some have supposed the Christ to be a mere Man; some, that he is the self-existent *Jehovah*; some, that he is Both; and some, that he is Neither: and all these, though aiming at the same general end and design, *viz.* the honour of God, and the propagation of Christianity; yet, because they do not explane their difficulties in the same way, look upon one another as Heretics and enemies to God and Man; and can never speak of one another without abusive language.

Those, whose opinions appear most opposite to one another, are the *Sabellians* and *Socinians*. The rest have formed different systems, as well as they could, in order to avoid these two extremes; and it is very observable, that all the capital heresies, which have arisen in the Church, seem to be nothing more than such consequences, as

pious,

pious, honeſt, and ingenious men, might naturally enough have drawn and concluded upon, from the opinions of the orthodox.

And firſt; It was very natural for the *Sabellians* to argue from theſe orthodox principles, *viz.* that the Son was of the ſame ſubſtance with the Father, and had all the divine Attributes: and that they were not (δύο πράγματα) two things; and that there is only one God, and Chriſt is the ſame one God with the Father; to the concluſion, which peculiariſed their ſect; that the Father and Son muſt be one and the ſame, under different names or characters. —This hereſy was held in the Weſt by the *Patripaſſians*, and in the Eaſt by the *Sabellians*, under *Hermogenes*, *Praxeas*, *Noetus*, *Victorinus*, &c. *Noetus* being queſtioned about it, anſwered; Τί γὰρ κακὸν πεποίηκα; ἕνα Θεὸν δοξάζω, ἕνα ἐπίσταμαι· καὶ ἐὰν ἄλλον [illegible] γεννηθέντα, πεπονθότα, ἀποθανόντα; "What evil have I done? I glorify one God, "I know one God, and that no other was born, ſuffered, and "died, except him[a]." They believed one ſingular and individual ſubſtance with three perſonal denominations, μίαν ὑπόστασιν τρίπροσωπον, or, ἓν τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ[a]. Dr. *Cudworth* ſays; they believed but one "Hypoſtaſis or ſingular individual Eſſence of the Father, "Son and Holy Ghoſt; and conſequently, that they were but three "ſeveral Names, or Notions, or Modes, of one and the ſelf-ſame "Thing[b]." And here they agree with the nominal *Trinitarians*; and moſt of the reformed Churches.

Dupin indeed ſays of *Praxeas*; that he acknowledged but one Perſon in God, not diſtinguiſhing the Father from the Son; and conſequently maintained, that the Father was made Man, and ſuffered for us[c]: and *Theodoret*[d] may perhaps ſeem to agree with Him; for, ſpeaking of the *Montaniſts*, he ſays; ſome of them with *Sabellius* denied the three Perſons in the Godhead, and ſaid the Father Son and Holy Ghoſt were the ſame; τὸν αὐτὸν, the ſame. But theſe notions, *viz.* that the *three Perſons* are the ſame *one Perſon*, and that the Father ſuffered; were not expreſsly held by the *Sabellians*: but drawn as conſequences from their doctrines by their adverſaries. For we are told by *Baſil*; that it was not unity of Perſon, but unity of Eſſence, which was objected to them; which was probably the ſame *homoouſian* doctrine, that was once maintained by *Paulus*

[a] Pearſon, 158. [b] Cudworth, 605. [c] Dupin, Nov. Bib. p. 98. [d] Burnet's Animadverſions on Mr. Hill's Book, p. 6. [e] Bulli Op. p. 36. [f] Jackſon's Reply to Dr. Waterland, p. 472.

Samoſatenus;

Samosatenus; and is now held by the nominal *Trinitarians*, and established by the *Lateran* Council:—For *Basil* says, it is *Sabellianism* to confess one Substance (that is, one *numerical* Substance) of three Persons; *unam trium Personarum substantiam vel rem*[f]: so says *Greg. Nazianzen*[g], and *Victor Africanus*[h]. He thought the Substance of the Father, was *substantia solida, sive ὐσία* and *hypostasis*; but the Son and Holy Ghost to be only *ἐνεργειαι*; comparing the Father to the Substance of the Sun, the Son to the Illumination or Ray, and the Holy Ghost to its Heat—giving Essence to the Father, Knowledge to the Son, and Life to the Holy Ghost. *Epiphanius* says; in the one Substance of the Deity, *Sabellius* puts three Names; as in Man are reckoned Body, Soul, and Spirit. From whence it appears; that what is said of *Sabellius*, "that he believed the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be "the same;" is not to be understood, as if the Father was the Son, and the Son the Spirit: but that the same one God is Father, Son, and Spirit; as one Man is Body, Soul, and Spirit: and so *Epiphanius* explains it[i]. "So that the Essence of *Sabellianism*, and the "doctrine of *Paulus Samosatenus*, evidently destroyed the real exist-"ence of the Person of the Son;" making all the Persons to be *ταυτοὐσιοι*[k], one and the same identical existing Being: [*ἐν πρᾶγμα*]. In opposition to which opinion, *Origen* and *Eusebius* "assert; that "the Son, or Word, is not the one supreme God over all: that "being the notion, for which *Sabellius* was excommunicated;"[l] and it is the present opinion of the *Pseudoathanasians*: and indeed, as to the main question, who it was that suffered and died for mankind; it is not easy to see, wherein the *Sabellians* and *Pseudoathanasians* differ: since they both agree, that the Son was supreme God. But both of them have their Evasions. The *Sabellians*, though they confess the Son to be *homoousious* with the Father, and the same numerical Essence; yet, in order to avoid this consequence, that the Trinity was born of the Virgin Mary and suffered, which seems to follow from their doctrine; declare, that Christ was a mere Man—Sandii Nuc. 188. Dr. *Cave* says the same of *Paulus Samosatenus*; *Artemonis hæresin instauravit, Christum Dei Verbum subsistentiam a Patre distinctam habere negans, ipsum tamen in terras descendentem nudum hominum fuisse, ante Mariam non exstitisse, & nomen Filii Dei non nisi bonis operibus meruisse.* Hist. Lit. 98. or, in other

[f] Epist. 64. 391. 349. Sandii Nuc. 179. [g] Or 21. [h] 1 Cont. Ar. [i] Hær. 65. See [k] Note VIII. [l] Jackson p. 460

words, *alium esse Deum Verbum, alium Christum*: Sandii Nuc. 191. by which notion they seem to agree with the *Cerinthians*; making the Word of God a different Person from Christ.

But the *Pseudoathanasians*, in order to avoid the same difficulty, tell you; that it was not the Father, (whom they allow to be the supreme God,) that suffered; but the Son, (whom they declare to be the same supreme God, but yet a different Person;) who suffered only in the Human nature; the Divinity being impassible. Thus they also divide Christ; and fall into the same heresy. But more of this hereafter.

Now as it is impossible, that the Supreme God of the Universe should, under any character, suffer and die, and be rewarded; this doctrine is a contradiction to the fundamental articles of Christianity: and therefore cannot be the Truth. This Heresy arose from endeavouring to preserve to the Son, an Equality with the Father; and to maintain at the same time the doctrine of the Unity.—We are told by *Irenæus*, *Austin*, and *Theodoret*; that the Author of this Sect was *Simon Magus*.

The *Socinians*, on the other hand, argued from the general orthodox belief that the Son of God had suffered and died; that he could not be that Supreme God, whom all parties acknowledged to be impassible: *quippe Deo mutuata nullo modo ascribi posse*, says Bishop *Bull*[m]. And from thence they concluded (with the *Sabellians*), that he was a mere Man; who never did exist, till he was born of the Virgin *Mary*: but that he was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and for that reason was called the Son of God; for they did not believe, with the *Ebionites* and *Theodotians*, that he was begotten by *Joseph*. And, what is said of the Word of God by St. *John*, they explain of the Gospel; and not of a real Person: and these two articles are the criterion of this sect; however, those who hold them may differ, upon matters of less importance.

Now, how plausible soever this hypothesis may be, upon the foot of Reason; so far as Christ is considered only as a Prophet sent by God, upon the gracious design of instructing, and reforming the world, under the immediate influence and direction of God: yet, when the Christian system is described in the New Testament, as a Mediatorial Scheme, and Christ is considered as a Saviour; the *Socinian* principles are utterly inconsistent with the whole process.

[m] Bulli Op. p. 60.

For we are not ſaved by the Revelation of Chriſt, as a Prophet; but by his Power, as a King and Conqueror; when he led captivity captive, and received gifts for men: i.e. when, having conquered Sin and Death, he received the power of forgiving Sin, raiſing the Dead, and giving eternal Life. But theſe gifts and powers he received in reward of his Humility, in quitting the glory of his pre-exiſtent ſtate; as well as his Sufferings and Obedience in this. It was becauſe He that was ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ, in the form of God, as he appeared in *Shechinah*, or ἐν δόξῃ Θεοῦ, to the Patriarchs; humbled himſelf, and took upon him the form of a Servant; that God hath given him a name, that is above every name; that in the name of *Jeſus* every knee ſhould bow. *Phil.* xi. 6—10. Becauſe he emptied himſelf of his Glory, which he had with God before the world was. *John* xvii. 5. That though he was rich, yet for Man's ſake he became poor; that they through his poverty might be rich. 2 *Cor.* viii. 9. Theſe are the reaſons given us in Scripture, why he was exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour; and was made King of Kings, and Lord of Lords. And theſe things prove; that he was in a ſtate of Glory, before he came into this world. And accordingly we are told, as plainly as can be; that he came down from Heaven: *John* iii. 13. xiii. 3. xvi. 28. That he was before all things: and by him do all things conſiſt: *Col.* i. 17. That all things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made: *John* i. 3. That he was the Word, that was in the beginning with God, and was God. And beſides this, the extraordinary Love of God, in not with holding his only-begotten Son, but freely giving him up for mankind, is ſpoken of in ſuch a manner; as proves him to have been a much greater being than a mere Man; though made for a little while lower than the Angels. And this is clearly intimated in the words of Chriſt to the *Phariſees*; What think you of Chriſt? whoſe Son is he? They ſay unto him, The Son of *David*. He ſaith unto them, How then doth *David* in Spirit call him Lord? Saying, The Lord ſaid unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footſtool. If *David* call him Lord, How is he his Son? *Mat.* xxii. 42. *&c. Mark* xii. 37. *Luke* xx. 41. *Pſalm* cx. 1. The Texts, that can only be explaned upon theſe principles, are very numerous; which they attempt to explane away into a figurative meaning; but without ſucceſs; for he, that ſhall without prejudice examine their interpretation of the beginning of

St. John's Gospel [n], will find them as far-fetch'd and as unsatisfactory, as Dr. *Henry More*'s Philosophical and Metaphysical Cabbala, upon the Three first Chapters of *Genesis*.

Bishop *Hoadly* says of them; that they seem to be vanished, and not to have been so much as spoken-of for many years; and that their interpretations of some passages in Scripture are universally rejected; as inconsistent with all the best rules of interpretation [o]. But however they seem to be growing again into Fashion, as to their Doctrines; though they are ashamed of the Name.

A late writer of this stamp objects to the *Sabellians*; that they consider the *Word of God* only as an Attribute; whereas he supposes it to mean the Gospel, p. 56. But this is one of the chief errors of the *Socinians*; and what they labour *manibus pedibusque* to establish: and besides, it is just the same thing, as to the personal existence of the Son before all worlds, whether we believe the Word to mean an Attribute, with the *Sabellians*; or the Gospel, with the *Socinians*. The same writer finds fault with the *Socinians*, and would appear to differ from them, by telling us, "They do not "believe the Fulness of the Godhead dwelt in the man Jesus; but "represent him as one, in whom God did not speak; but who "spake and wrought by his own human Spirit; or who was taught "of God, but partially, as *Moses* and the other Prophets; receiving "the Spirit by measure only [p]. But it does not appear, that the *Socinians* in general had any such notions. On the contrary, *Grotius*, who favours them, tells us; that "the Plenitude of the divine "virtues dwelt in Jesus Christ; that is to say, it was perpetually and "inseparably united; and not by intervals, as in the Prophets [q]. And Mr. *Sovereain*, the supposed author of *Platonism unveiled*, who is entirely *Socinian*, says; "This is what is called the hypostatic union of the "divine with the human nature; even this *Shechinah* or this per-"petual inhabitation of the Spirit of God in Jesus Christ [r]. And again he expresses the very doctrine of this writer: "We need say "no more than this; that Jesus himself was a Man; and a God, "with respect to God dwelling in him; so that Man is not the "Lord Jehovah, but the Lord is in the Man; and whatever Name "he has, and Power he clames; 'tis not the voice of the Temple,

[n] See Pearson on the Creed, p. 116. Unitar. Tracts. Vol. i. Tr. viii. p. 26. 43. Vol. ii. Tr. iii. p. 27. Dawson's Illustration of several Texts, p. 65. &c. [o] Answer to the Dean of Worcester's Sermon, p. 4. [p] p. 84. 131. [q] Grotius on Col. i. 19. [r] Le Plat. Dev. part 2, ch. vi.

" but of Him who dwells in it." Which was also the opinion of *Nestorius* and *Photinus*. Sandii Nuc. 186.

This Heresy of *Socinus*, we are told by *Sandius*, is a very modern one; for he says, no Christian ever held the same opinion of Christ, but all the Heretics agree'd with the Orthodox and *Catholics* in this, that they determined the Word of God to be God: and to have existed before ages, and that the whole Universe was created by him[t]. The great care of this sect was, to maintain the Unity and Impassibility of the Father; and in doing this they degraded the nature and character of the Son. But they mean as well as those, who see things in a different and a better light; and are force'd into these principles, for fear they should be obliged to admit of the Death and Sufferings of the supreme God: not being satisfied with the evasions of the *Sabellians* and *Pseudo-athanasians*, both which fall in with the errors of *Cerinthus*.

that Socinus did:

there is no doubt

We are now to consider the *Arians*. The chief view of these, as well as of the Orthodox, seems to have been; to steer their course between the two extremes of *Sabellianism* and *Socinianism*.[u] To which purpose the *Arians* maintain, against the *Sabellians*, that the Son of God is a Being distinct and different from the Father; and not a mere Virtue, or Character, or Mode of existence: and against the *Socinians*, as well as the *Nestorians* and *Sabellians*, who held *alium esse Deum Verbum, alium Christum*[x]; that Christ was not a mere Man, but a true God.

It is difficult to ascertain the opinions of those Heretics, whose works are destroyed; and the writings of *Arius* were condemned to the flames, under pain of death to all who should concele them, by *Constantine*; as were those of *Eunomius* the *Arian*, by *Arcadius*: a small part of those writings have escaped; and the account which is given of them by their enemies, is contradictory and inconsistent; being generally not the very words of the Heretics, but the glosses and consequences which their adversaries have drawn from them unfairly; and which the Heretics themselves disavow.

The Creed which was delivered in by *Arius* at the Council of *Jerusalem* in 335, was this: We believe in one God, the Father Almighty; and in the Lord Jesus Christ his Son, begotten of him before all ages; God the Word, by whom all things were made, which are in Heaven and in Earth; who came down and was in-

[t] Le Plat. Dev. c. 22. [u] Sandii Nuc. 117. 147. [x] Sandii Nuc. 191.

carnate,

carnate, and ſuffered, and roſe again, and aſcended to the Heavens; and ſhall come again to judge the living and the dead: and in the Holy Ghoſt: the reſurrection of the Fleſh: the life of the world to come: and the Kingdom of Heaven: in one catholic church of God, extending itſelf from one end of the earth unto the other[x]. And the Creed of *Eunomius* begins; We believe in one God, the Father Almighty; of whom are all things: and in one only begotten, the Son of God, God the Word, our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; by whom are all things. And in his Apology he ſays; We believe alſo in the Son of God, the only begotten God, the firſt born of the whole creation, Chriſt true God, not unbegotten[y]. And Mr. *R. Baxter* tells us; the *Arians* maintained, that "*Tres ſunt Hypoſtaſes; Pater, Filius, & Spiritus* "*Sanctus*; and that God did *ante ſempiterna tempora unigenitum* "*filium gignere, per quem & ſecula & reliqua procreavit omnia*; viz. "*ſubſiſtentem illum ſuapte voluntate condidiſſe, ejuſmodi ut neque con-* "*verti neque mutari poſſit, perfectam Dei creaturam, ſed non tan-* "*quam rerum creatarum aliquam; ſceptro itidem, ſed non tanquam* "*unum e ceteris.* They thought; that, before God made the reſt of "the creatures, he made one ſuperangelical perfect ſpirit, by which "he made all the reſt; and that this is Chriſt: and that he received "no other Soul, but a Body only, at his Incarnation: and this ſuper-"angelical ſpirit was his Soul. This, Mr. *Baxter* ſays, was the "dangerous Hereſy of *Arius*." See two Epiſtles of *Arius* recorded by *Epiphanius*.

In ſhort, the *Arians* ſeem to have believed that Chriſt was the Word of God, and was in the beginning with God: but was not the ſelf-exiſtent God, with whom he was in the beginning; but his Son, created by the Father before all ages, one ſuperangelical and perfect Spirit; and thereby became his only Son, by whom he created all other Beings: and that when he came down from Heaven to inhabit the body, which was prepared for him in the Womb of the bleſſed Virgin; this ſuperangelical Spirit alone was the Soul that informed and enlivened it. Beſides theſe notions, they explained themſelves upon others, which they received from Tradition, for which *Arius* was condemned; *viz.* That there was Duration before the Word was; ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν· that he was made out of nothing;

[x] Baxter's Ch. Hiſt. 53.

[y] Fabritii Bib. Græ. vol. viii. 311. 252. and Cave's Hiſt. Lit. See Arius's Letter concerning his Faith, to Pope Alexander; in Epiph. Hær. 67. 7. 8. and in Hilary, l. iv. and Sandii Nuc. l. 3. p. 122.

ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων· and that he was not, before he was begotten; πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν. These are his own words, in his Letter to *Eusebius*; "We suffer Persecution; because we say, the Son hath a beginning; "the Father hath no beginning; on this account we suffer Perse-"cution, and because we assert that he is of nothing[a]." And this assertion he defends in the same Letter, as follows. "If the Father "begat a Son, he that was begotten had a beginning of his exis-"tence; whence it follows, that the Son was not always; and con-"sequently, that he had his existence of nothing[b]."

To which his Adversaries reply; that he existed, before he was begotten; and was begotten from the substance of the Father.

Bishop *Bull* says; *Summa Doctrinæ*, all that the *Nicene* Fathers maintained against *Arius*, was this; that the Son of God was begotten of the proper substance of God, and thereby became very God of very God[c]. And upon this question the *Athanasians* argued as follows; If Christ were not the same substance with the Father, he could not be God; and to deny his Divinity, is to give-up the fundamental Principle of Christianity. And the *Arians* argued; If Christ be the same substance with the Father, he must be impassible, and did not suffer; and the fundamental Article of Christianity is given-up by denying his Sufferings.

Besides this, they thought it blasphemous to assert a literal generation from the divine substance: and argued upon it as follows; *viz.* That, in such a generation, either the substance of the Father must be divided; which is a denial of his ἀφθαρσία, or incorruptibility; or else the Father must, as to his undivided substance, be both Father and Son; and be compounded of two substances, one begotten and the other unbegotten; which is inconsistent with his simple Unity. And to say, the Son existed before he was begotten; is not only absurd; but egregious Folly—for if he existed before he was begotten, he was unbegotten: ὑπὲρ οὐκ ἀτοπίας μόνον, ἀ βλασφημίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάσης εὐηθείας ὑπερβολὴν ἂν ἔχοι—εἰ γὰρ πρὸ τῆς γεννήσεως ἦν, ἀγέννητος ἦν. [illegible] vol. viii. 278. And upon this account they rejected the word *homoousious*.

[a] *Persecutiones patimur, quod dixerimus; Initium habet Filius, sed Deus initio caret; propter hoc "illum persecutiones patimur, & quod asseruimus esse de nihilo.* Sandii Nuc. l. 2. p. 10.

[b] *Si pater genuit filium, eum qui genitus est suæ essentiæ habere principium: indeque perspicuum esse filium aliquando non fuisse; necessarioque sequi eum ex nihilo essentiam habuisse.*

[c] *Sane autem Filium Dei ex propria Dei Substantiâ genitum, ac proinde de Deo vero Deum verum esse, summa est Doctrinæ quam Patres Nicæni contra Arium asseruerunt.* Bulli Op. p. 3.

This

This seems to be the general and fundamental argument in *Eunomius*; which runs through his book, and upon which his particular expressions are built, which naturally arise from this general principle; as I shall shew in the Notes[c]. And because Dr. *Cave* has given the opinions of *Arius*, in *Arius*'s own words, I shall take notice of them all; whereby you will see, not only wherein the *Arians* and *Athanasians* differ; but judge of the true and genuine sense of the *Arian* expressions, and whether they have endeavoured to explain away or soften their real sentiments, as they are accused.

The opinions of many other Heretics upon the subjects of the Generation and Incarnation of Christ, if fairly examined into, will appear to have arisen from the very same cause; *viz.* from their endeavour to explane the seeming contradiction, how Jesus Christ is God, and at the same time capable of sufferings and death; and it was upon account of the extreme nicety, which is necessary in order to avoid Heresy, on one side or other of these questions; that those who wrote against one Heresy, were so often accused of falling into the contrary one; as *Dionysius* the Great, *Alexander* of *Alexandria*, *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*[d], *&c.* and *Dupin* says, that *Origen* was obliged to use terms, which appeared to favour the opposite error. And among the moderns here in *England*, the same misfortune has befallen Bishop *Fowler*, Archbishop *Tillotson*, Bishop *Burnet*, *&c.* So that none of the great Men at present choose to explane themselves upon these subjects. And if this was the case of orthodox writers, when examined by one another, and the best sense was put upon their words; what could the Heretics expect, who had no such indulgence; but whose words were strained the other way? or who can wonder that some men were condemned, and others acquitted; who had said the very same things?

As to the vulgar notion, that the ancient Heretics (I mean those that taught what they believed, and are improperly called by that name) were in any respect worse than other men; there is no good reason to suspect it. They were as learned, and as ready to give-up their Preferments, or suffer Martyrdom, for Conscience-sake, as the Orthodox; and the learned men among the moderns, have fallen into many of the same opinions, for which they were condemned. So that, whatever the Vulgar may think, one would expect that

[c] Note IX. [d] Daillé, 95.

Philo-

Philoſophers and Scholars would be ſparing of ſuch reflections; when they ſee that men of the moſt unexceptionable characters in all reſpects, have taken different ſides in this argument. *Grotius*, and the *Fratres Poloni*, favour the *Socinians*: *Sandius*, *Eraſmus*, *Chillingworth*, *Epiſcopius*, *Petavius*, ſpeak favourably of the *Arians*[a]. And we can have no reaſon to imagine, theſe great men were inſincere; or careleſs in their reſearches. In ſhort, what *Salvian* ſays of the *Arians*, is true of all Heretics of that kind; i. e. all who believed the Doctrines which they taught: "They are Here-"tics, but know it not: Heretics to us, but not to themſelves. "Nay, they think themſelves ſo catholic, that they judge us "to be Heretics: what They are to Us, that We are to Them: "they err, but with a good mind; and for this cauſe God "ſhews mercy unto them[b]." And if the Orthodox, or *Arians*, had been as good Chriſtians as *Salvian*; they would have ſhewn mercy to one another: But that was a principle of Chriſtianity, ſcarce ever thought of among them. What *Procopius* ſays[c] of *Juſtinian*, was the general notion of the Chriſtians for many ages: "He did not believe he was guilty of Murder; when he condemned "to death thoſe, who made profeſſion of a religion different from "his own[d]." But the Chriſtians have gone far beyond this; and maſſacred the members of their own churches, merely for differing upon ſubjects which neither ſide underſtood[e]. This was what St. *John* was ſo amazed at, when he ſaw the Chriſtian Church drunk with the blood of the Saints and Martyrs of Jeſus; "And when I "ſaw her, ſays he, I wondered with great admiration[f]." *St. John* was not ſurpriſed, that the Chriſtians ſhould be perſecuted by the Heathens; for this he had ſeen before, in the reigns of *Nero* and *Domitian*: But that the members of the meek and holy Jeſus, ſhould know ſo little of the true ſpirit of Chriſtianity, as to murder one another; was a matter of the greateſt aſtoniſhment to him. And yet in this practical Apoſtaſy from the moſt eſſential part of Chriſtianity, their Love to one another, the very criterion by which he declares his ſubjects ſhould be known to belong to him; all Sects among them have agree'd without Exception: Orthodox and Heretic, Papiſt and Proteſtant, Churchman and Diſſenter; all in their turns have thought proper to ſhew their zele againſt the *nation-deſtroying*

[a] Note X. Bennet's Irenicum.
[b] Bennet's Irenicum, p. 64.
[c] Note IV.
[d] Procop. in Anec. p. 67.
[e] Rev. xvii. 6.

ſin

ſin of Toleration; as it was called in *Cromwell's* time: and for ſetching the Devil out of other men's conſciences, have made no ſcruple of giving him a free entrance into their own; not knowing what ſpirit they were of. Good God! What amazing ignorance, prejudice, and preſumption! That men, frail men! that know not the eſſence of a blade of Graſs; and are liable to overſight, miſapprehenſion, and error, upon the plaineſt ſubjects; ſhould dare to murder and damn their Fellow-Creatures, and Fellow-Chriſtians; for not agreeing with them in opinion about the Eſſence of the ſupreme God! O my Soul, come not thou into their ſecret; unto their Aſſembly, O mine Honour, be not thou united[k].

I am now to conſider the opinions of the Orthodox, on theſe ſubjects. And here it is not only difficult to determine, what Orthodoxy is; but what Authors we are to conſult for information, and in what ſenſe they are to be underſtood[l].

For the Orthodoxy of the Church has been very different, in different Ages; and what is now called by that name in the Church of *Rome*, was not completed till the Lateran Council in 1215; and conſequently is not above 556 years ſtanding: as I ſhall go on to prove.

1ſt. By ſhewing, that the Orthodoxy of the Church has been very different, in different Ages; and,

2d. By tracing the progreſs of Orthodoxy, through the ſeveral changes it has undergone, till it became what it now is.

1ſt. That the orthodoxy of the Church has been very different in different ages, appears from the writings both of Proteſtants and Papiſts. *Sandius* undertakes to prove in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, that all Antiquity was *Arian*; and Mr. *Jurieu*, the *French* Reformer, ſays; Every one knows this Myſtery [of the Trinity] remained *informé*, without its right form and ſhape, till the Council of *Nice*; nay, until that of *Conſtantinople*; (in 381, when the Holy Ghoſt was firſt decreed to be Lord:) and this he repreſents in two great points, the temporal generation of the Son, and his inequality to the Father; both which he ſhews by proper citations to have been unanimouſly profeſſed by the ancients of the three firſt ages[m].

[k] Exod. xlix. 6. [l] Daillé's right Uſe of Fathers, Cap. 3. Note XI. [m] Emlyn's Tracts, Vol. ii. 279. Jurieu Paſt. Let. 6. p. 125. 12°.

And

And the Popiſh party make no ſcruple to confeſs; that the Doctrine of the Trinity, as it is now held, can neither be proved from Scripture; nor the conſent of the Ancients [n]; whom they accuſe of Hereſy, becauſe they differ from them: reſolving the whole evidence of their Faith into the authority of the Church. Cardinal *Perron* taxes *Origen*, *Euſebius*, *Irenæus*, and *Tertullian*, with the ſame Hereſy; and ſays of all the Fathers before the Council of *Nice*, in general, that the *Arians* would gladly be tried by them: and accordingly *Eunomius*, the *Arian* [o], refers to Them; as of the ſame opinions with himſelf: and *Petavius* ſays, of *Juſtin Martyr*, and almoſt all the Fathers before that Council; *cum orthodoxæ fidei regula minime conſentiunt*: they do not at all agree with the rule of Orthodoxy [p]: and accuſes them of *Platoniſm*, and of having corrupted the purity of the Chriſtian Faith [q]. *St. Jerom* ſays, Before *Arius*, that impudent Devil, (*dæmonium meridianum*) appeared in the World, the Fathers had delivered many things innocently; and without taking ſo much heed to their words, as they might have done: and indeed ſome things, that can hardly eſcape the cavils of wrangling ſpirits. *Apol. con. Ruff. Daille*, 80. Accordingly, *Dupin* ſays of *Tertullian*; "He ſpeaks in a manner not entirely agreable to the notions of the "later ages; but we muſt pardon the Ancients ſuch kind of expreſſions, who wrote before the terms they uſed were fixed to a "certain ſenſe [r]." And ſpeaking of *Juſtin Martyr*, who ſays, "the "Father is inviſible, the Son viſible, and the Majeſty of the Father "greater than that of the Son;" and of the opinion of *Theophilus*, Biſhop of *Antioch*; "that the Word can be in a Place, and was be"gotten in Time;" he ſays, "Theſe expreſſions, which are com"mon with the ancient Fathers; have another ſenſe in their mouths, "than that which the *Arians* have given them ſince [s]." And of *Clemens Alexandr.* he ſays; "He follows the manner of the An"cients, in ſaying the Word was viſible [t];" and in ſpeaking of the Opinion of *Origen*, that the Word and Spirit were made by the Father; he ſays, "Theſe expreſſions are very common before the "Council of *Nice*; and too common with the Ancients, to make "it a Crime in *Origen*." *Dupin* 136. And Biſhop *Bull* ſays; "He was wholly catholic, in the Article of the Trinity; though he

[n] Note XII. [o] Eunom. Apol. C. iv. [p] Chillingworth's Preface, 17. 18. Petav. 269. ad Hær. 69. [q] Cudworth, 395. [r] Nouv. Bibl. p. 98. [s] Ibid. 66, 67. n. f. [t] Ibid. 84.

"ſometimes

"sometimes speaks otherwise than the Catholics do; which is no "more than almost all the Fathers did, who lived before the "Council of *Nice*." *Def. Fid. Nic.* Sect. xi. c. 9. 82.

So that, according to these learned men, instead of finding the Opinion of the ancient Fathers in their Works, we are to take it for granted; that they said one thing, and meant the direct contrary: a very modest Postulatum! One would wonder, how learned men could talk in this manner; or imagine, that any body of common sense would believe them. How much more probable is it, that the Faith of the Church *has* altered in *this* doctrine; as we find it *do's*, in almost every age, in *some* doctrine or other; according to the natural vicissitude of circumstances. And indeed, *Origen* is a most material evidence to prove this: who, though never questioned for any error in this matter, in or near his time; has caused so much dispute since. "*St. Jerom, John of Jerusalem, St. Epiphanius, St. Austin*, "and since them, *Theophilus, Justinian*, and the Fifth Council, did "accuse Him of Errors in the mystery of the Trinity: and on the "contrary, the more ancient Writers, *Didymus, St. Athanasius*, "*St. Basil, St. Gregory Naz.* an anonymous Author quoted by "*Photius, St. John Chrysostom*, and *Russinus*, cite him against the "*Arians*; as an Author, who had orthodox notions of the Trinity; "and even defended It against it's Enemies[a]." And *Demetrius*, who was his Bishop and great Enemy, commends him for the purity of his Faith[b]: nay, if we leave these Authorities, and "consult the "parts of his Works which we have in *Greek*; here again, says "*Dupin*, we find a Labyrinth not easy to get out of. We meet "things there, which do not appear less contrary, than the senti- "ments of the Authors that have written for and against him[c]." And if this be the case, with regard to the primitive Fathers; we are so far from finding by Them, what is most Orthodox; that we are not enabled to distinguish the Orthodox from the Heretic: and (as Mr. *Soverain* observes from Mr. *Vasser*,) "we can receive no benefit "from the testimony of the Ancients, for the decision of those "points, which are now controverted; upon account of the em- "barrassments, into which their Philosophy hath brought them[d]." *Russinus* indeed, and others, alleged, that *Origen* had been corrupted

[a] Dupin. 135. [b] Jackson's Reply, 328. Eusеb. Hist. Eccle. L. 6. c. 7. [c] Dupin. [d] De Platon. Dev. 82. Traité de l'examen. c. 1. p. 10.

by

by Heretics: but *Jerom* laughs at this notion; and contends, that it was not possible [a].

But, suppose it true; yet all the Fathers could not be corrupted: especially, where so many of them have agreed in plane and regular Systems; which they have laid-down professedly in many places, and taken pains to prove and establish by many arguments.

Dupin endeavours to account for this difference in the Faith of the Church, by saying; The Terms, which were used by the Ancients, were not then fixed to a certain Sense; and *Petavius* says, The subjects were not explained and understood: *eadem satis illustrata ac patefacta minime erant*. But this is not sufficient to account for the Fact. For admitting the Ancients had not fixed the same sense to the words, Person, Substance, Nature, &c. which has been given them since; yet certainly they understood what they mean'd by saying, the Father was invisible, and infinite, the Son visible and finite. They knew what they mean'd, when they held the Generation of the Word to be *in Tempore*, a little before the Creation of the World; of whom the learned Dr. *Bull* has given a long list [b]: and what they mean'd by declaring Christ to be the Angel of the Covenant, that appeared to the Patriarchs [c]; which *Austin* hath since endeavoured to confute. They did not therefore differ from the Moderns, only in the use of abstruse terms, but in plane and intelligible doctrines: not because they did not take heed to their Words, as *Jerom* suggests, but because they were of different Opinions. And the reason of their differing, was, because they had not settled a consistent Scheme, between their Christianity, and the Philosophy they had introduced into it. Their first notions therefore, in the days of *Origen*, *Clemens Alexandr.* &c. were crude and undigested. For example, *Origen* in one place tells us, that the Father and Son are one Substance, which the Greeks call *homoousion*; and in the very next Chapter of the same Book, declares, that the Son is of another Substance, and created; *alterius substantiæ, & creatum*: as we are informed by *Russinus*. *Bulli Op.* p. 29. And afterwards, when they began to examine these subjects at the Council of *Nice*, and reduce them into a System; they were divided into Parties: and *Episcopius* says, in the midst of party rage and fury, and upon principles which were taken up on a sudden, they rather huddled-up a Creed for the

[a] Apol. ii. Adv. Rust. Jackson's Reply, 325. [b] Note XIII. [c] Note XIV.

tion

Church, than ſeriouſly conſidered the ſubjects of debate. And *Melchior Canus* (Loci Theol. lib. 5. cap. 5.) ſays; It is an uſual thing, believe me, for all the Judges of the Church, when they publiſh their decrees, to be driven on by a certain Raſhneſs and Suddenneſs of judgment, as by a Wind: ſo that they effect nothing, which may be looked upon as ſolid, grave, or certain. *Jenkins*, p. 73.

Mr. *Jurieu* indeed ſays; the differences of theſe points made no alteration in the Chriſtian Faith: and "that all the vain and "forced ſpeculations of the Doctors of that [age, the Fathers of "the three firſt ages] did not hinder the purity of the Church; that "is, of the People. [7 did not reach ſo far, as to Them; they re-"maned in the plane Doctrines; and the reſt was for the ſpecu-"lative Divines, the Philoſophers brought-up in the ſchool of "*Plato*; ſuch as were *Juſtin Martyr*, *Tatian* his diſciple, *Athena-*"*goras* another *Platoniſt*, and others of the ſame ſort." He ends with ſaying; "Every one knows, that Theological Explications "are not a part of the Faith: *ne ſont de Foy*[a]. In ſhort, he ſeems to be as much afraid of admitting a change in the Faith of the Church; as if he were a Romaniſt, and his whole Religion depended upon the Church's infallibility. In like manner we are told by *Origen*, that Chriſtians are divided into two claſſes; the firſt, of Infants in the Faith; who are governed by Evangelical Principles: the ſecond, of intelligent and elevated Souls; who are capable of comprehending the Divinity of the Word-God glorified[b]. And he acquaints his Readers, in the beginning of his Book περὶ Ἀρχῶν, that the ſacred Writers do not concern themſelves with abſtruſe matters and ſpeculative points; which few of them whom they called to the Chriſtian Religion were capable of underſtanding: but confined themſelves to thoſe few clear articles, which were neceſſary for the reformation of the World; to bring them into a ſtate of Righteouſneſs, and give them hopes of Immortality: leaving the more refined Contemplations, which were not contrary to prime Truths, to the commendable Curioſity of thoſe, whom Nature and Education qualified for ſuch enquiries. *Le Platon. Dev.* 272.

But this is not the caſe, at preſent; for, whether the Chriſtians are

7 These ... faith of th

[a] Epiſcop. Note XV. [b] Tabl. de Socin. Part 1. Let. 6. Le Plat. Dev. 241. 242.

[c] Ibid. 275.

now

now grown to be all of them Philoſophers and elevated Souls, or whatever be the reaſon; the Philoſophical Theology, which was confined to learned men in the days of *Origen*, and upon which They could never agree; is now looked-upon as a fundamental part of the Chriſtian Religion, and uſed in the common ſervice of the Churches; the Laws for deſtroying Heretics are founded upon it; it is conſidered as a ſufficient ground for Perſecution in this world; and Damnation in the next. The Ignorant are as much concerned in it, as the Learned; being ſubject to the ſame Penalties, if found guilty of Hereſy; and it is eſteemed to be as much a part of the Faith, in the proſecutions by Law for Hereſy; as the Scripture itſelf: and conſequently, an alteration in theſe Doctrines, is an alteration in the Doctrines of the Church; to all intents and purpoſes.

Having now ſhewn, that the Orthodoxy of the Church has been very different, in different Ages; I ſhall procede to trace the Progreſs of it; till it became what it now is.

If we conſult the primitive Fathers of the Church in the firſt ages, ſuch as *Clemens Romanus*, *Hermas*, *Polycarp*, *&c.*; we ſhall receive little or no information, upon thoſe metaphyſical points; which have ſince been looked-upon to be fundamental articles, and teſts of orthodoxy. They are ſo remarkable for ſpeaking in the plane ſtyle of the Apoſtles, and not entering into metaphyſical queſtions; that the Critics judge of the antiquity of their writings, by their being free from ſuch ſubjects: the very word Trinity being unknown in the Church, till after the year 200[a]; and the myſteries of the Trinity and Incarnation not ſpoken-of in form, till after the fourth age of the Church; nor the word *Hypoſtaſis* uſed, to ſignify Divine Perſon, till the end of the fourth[b].

The Fathers who ſucceded theſe, were brought-up in the School of *Alexandria* in *Egypt*[i]; and not contented with the ſimplicity of the Goſpel, which was to the *Greeks* Fooliſhneſs, endeavoured to embelliſh it with all the ornaments of the Academy: and the Chriſtian Theology was explaned according to the Platonic Syſtem; and agreed in ſome things with the notions afterwards held by the *Arians*, and in others with the *Nicene* Council. Biſhop *Stillingfleet* obſerves, what tampering there was by times, to bring Chriſtianity down to Philoſophy; rather than to make Philoſophy truckle under the ſimplicity of the Scriptures[k]. And *Huetius* ſays,

[a] Dup'n. in Theophilus. [b] Ibid. Tom. i. page 36. [i] Note XIV.

Orig. Sacr. Hy they.

they rather endeavoured to accommodate the Scriptures to the Platonic Philosophy of the *Alexandrian* School; than to reform that School by the help of the Scriptures. And accordingly, *Dupin* has observed of *Justin Martyr*; *Il est vray que sur la Trinité il semble estre different de Nous, en suivant les principes des Platoniciens*[k]. He learns to differ from us about the Trinity, by following the principles of the Platonists.

Now the Philosophy of the Platonists supposed a subordination and dependency of the second and third Hypostasis upon the first: which was not only the belief of *Justin Martyr*, but of *Clemens Alexandr. Origen*, and others of the *Alexandrian* School; and was maintained by the generality of the Christian Doctors, for the first three hundred years after the Apostles' time, who plainly asserted the same as *Athenagoras, Tertullian, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Dionysius* of *Alexandria, Lactantius*, and many others[l]; and therefore till that time, the generality of the Christian Fathers represent the Platonic Philosophy as really the same with the Christian, or so near it, that they chiefly differed in circumstances and manner of expression[m].

Upon which account, Bishop *Burnet* says, (in his Animadversions on Mr. *Hill*;) It does not become Mr. *Hill* to find fault with the Bishop, for having asserted; that the Fathers, before the Council of *Nice*, did conceive in the Trinity a Subordination, importing an Inequality of the two last Persons with the first. The Bishop has but too many proofs upon this Article; and none but those who never read the Ancients, or read them without attention, disown it. This is acknowledged by *Petavius*, Dr. *Cudworth*, and *Huetius*[n]. See *Bulli Op.* 258.

Another difference between these Fathers and their Successors, no less remarkable, is what Bishop *Bull* observes; *viz.* "That "almost all the Catholic Writers, before *Arius*'s time, seem not to have "known any thing of the Invisibility and Immensity of the Son of God; "and that they often speak of him in such a manner, as if, even in "respect of his divine Nature, he was finite, visible, and circumscribed in place[o]." And it was from these principles, that the Fathers who lived before the *Nicene* Council argued; that "the "Father alone being of his own Nature invisible, the apparitions

[k] Dupin, Tom. i. 59. [l] Cudworth, 595. [m] Ibid. 621. and Jurieu's Past. Letters in French, 12°. Letter vi. [n] Animadversions on Dr. Hill's Book. [o] Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. iv. C. iii. page 267.

"of God mentioned in the Old Teſtament, could not be aſcribed "to Him: but they muſt be referred only to the *Logos*; as to him, "whom the Father has not only employed as a Miniſter in the "Creation; but by whom alſo he always reveles himſelf under the "Old Teſtament[r]." But as this notion contradicted the doctrine of Conſubſtantiality, which the Orthodox afterwards eſtabliſhed at the Council of *Nice* againſt the *Arians*; it became out of repute: and has been very little regarded ever ſince, tho' ſo generally received before.

"This Notion," ſays Biſhop *Burnet*, "ſuppoſed the Father and "Son were not of the ſame Nature [Conſubſtantial]: and without "doubt, this was the reaſon that *St. Auſtin* did reject and confute "it; as appears in his book of the Trinity; and obliged thoſe, by "whom it was received, to reject it[s]." But this favourite Doctrine of Conſubſtantiality ſeems itſelf alſo to have been an Innovation in the Chriſtian Faith; and does not appear to have been generally received, till that time. For we are told by *Athanaſius*; that the eighty Fathers, who condemned *Samoſatenus*, affirmed expreſsly; that the Son is not of the ſame Eſſence with the Father: and by *Hilary*, that they rejected the Conſubſtantiality[t]. And Dr. *Cave* ſays; it was the Hereſy of *Samoſatenus*, that he denied the Word to be a diſtinct Subſtance from the Father. So that it ſhould ſeem, *Samoſatenus* was condemned for holding the ſame *homoouſion* Doctrine, which is now ſuppoſed to be Orthodox.

I ſhall now conſider the Orthodoxy, that was ſettled at the Council of *Nice*.

When the *Platoniſts* of the *Alexandrian* School ran into debates, about the metaphyſical Nature of the ſecond Hypoſtaſis; the Chriſtian Church of *Alexandria* became embroiled in the ſame Diſpute. Biſhop *Alexander* maintained, that the *Logos* exiſted from all Eternity; and was of the ſame Subſtance with the Father: and *Arius*, as Archbiſhop *Tenniſon* ſays, "being heated with the "diſpute, oppoſed him with Obſtinacy and Uproar[u];" for he accuſed him of *Sabellianiſm*[x]; a plane proof, that the word *homoouſios* was then capable of the ſame ſenſe, in which it was condemned in *Samoſatenus*. The Doctrine of *Alexander* was agreeable to that

[r] Ibid. Animadverſions. Note XI. [s] Animadverſions, page 46. [t] Note X.
[u] Tenniſon of Idol. 158. [x] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 2, 21, 22, 23. Soc. l. 1. Bennet's Len. 43.

off

of the *Platoniſts*[s], who held that the ſecond and third Hypoſtaſis proceeded from the firſt, and were of the ſame generical Nature; which the *Platoniſts* expreſſed by the word Γενος, and the *Nicene* Council, by Ὁμοούσιος, or Conſubſtantial. But this word was not mean'd at that time to include an Equality, as to the natural or moral attributes of God; (to which it was afterwards extended by Inference:) but merely to his metaphyſical Eſſence or Subſtance[t]. The Father and Son were ſuppoſed to be Conſubſtantial, by the *Nicene* Fathers; in the ſame Senſe in which all men are Conſubſtantial to one another: and conſequently equal, as to their Eſſence. For, as *Petavius* obſerves, in Identity there can be no Diverſity or Inequality. But they did not yet venture to argue, from an Equality of Subſtance, to an Equality in natural and moral Perfections; though they hereby laid the foundation for it, and for all other Doctrines, which were unavoidably derived from it by inference.

Biſhop *Bull* gives us the opinion of the *Nicenes*, as follows: The Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, being in reality three Perſons, [he means real Subſiſtences, ἐνυπόστατοι] yet they do not, as three Men, exiſt apart and ſeparate; but intimately cohere and join to each other, and, as I may ſo ſay, penetrate *(immeare invicem & penetrare)* each other: by an ineffable Perichoreſis, which the Schoolemen call Circumінceſſion; (*See Note* 16, k.) from whence *Petavius* contends, that the numerical Union is neceſſarily effected[u].

According to this opinion, each of the three Perſons has a particular Subſtance to itſelf; and theſe three are joined together into one: So that, as Dr. *Waterland* obſerves, the Subſtance of one Perſon is not the Subſtance of either of the other, but different; however of the ſame kind or united to them[w].

From hence it came to be a queſtion, even among the moſt orthodox; whether the Father and Son ſhould be called δύο πράγματα, or ἓν πράγμα: two Beings, or one. *Origen*, and *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, were blamed for calling them δύο πράγματα, and *Baſil* calls it a *Sabellian* expreſſion to call them ἓν πράγμα: and obſerves, very juſtly, that a thing is not Conſubſtantial to, or with itſelf; but one thing with another[x]. The ſame queſtion aroſe afterwards, with regard to the word *Hypoſtaſis*, or Subſtance; upon which, *Jerom*

[s] Note XVI. [t] Note XVII. Daillé, p. 80. [u] Bulli Op. 130. [w] Philal. Cantab. Remarks on Dr. Waterland's ſecond Defence, 14. [x] Baſil, Epiſ. ccc.

wrote

wrote to Pope *Damaſus*, to enquire whether he ſhould ſay one Hypoſtaſis or three; and the queſtion ſtill remains: though the Council of *Alexandria* in 362, decree'd; that thoſe who held one Hypoſtaſis, and thoſe who held three, were all of the ſame opinion.

But though the Doctrine of the *Nicene* Fathers, when preciſely expreſſed, appropriated the equality between the three Hypoſtaſes, to the divine Subſtance or Eſſence only, agreably to the doctrine of the *Platoniſts*; yet this reſtriction or limitation was not obſerved by all of them: but many, who were accounted Orthodox, becauſe they zelouſly oppoſed *Arianiſm*; conſidered this equality as relative to the perſonal Attributes alſo: arguing very juſtly from the *Nicene* Principles, that if the Subſtance of the Son was of the ſame generical Nature with that of the Father; he muſt in like manner be impaſſible, infinite, and inviſible. This was a language very little, if at all, uſed before the *Arian* Controverſy: but afterwards, every one being looked upon as a favourer of *Arius*, who ſhould ſpeak the language of the ancient Fathers, while there was no danger of ſwerving too far on the oppoſite ſide of the queſtion; the ſtyle of the Chriſtian Writers became very much altered: and they began to ſpeak of Chriſt in ſuch high terms, as rendered him in every reſpect equal to the Father; and conſequently incapable of local Motion, Incarnation, and Sufferings. And from hence aroſe another opinion of the Orthodox; which was not only oppoſite to the Fathers of the three firſt Centuries, but alſo to *Athanaſius* and the *Nicene* Council. And this was induſtriouſly purſued by *Gregory Nyſſen*, *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, *Maximus* the martyr, and *Damaſcen*; beſides ſeveral others both of the *Greeks* and *Latins*: and theſe were they, who principally inſiſted upon the abſolute Co-equality, and independent Co-ordination of the three Hypoſtaſes; conſidering them as three Individuals, diſtinct from one another as three men are; having no eſſential dependence upon one another, any more than *Thomas*, *Peter* and *John*; having the ſame ſpecific Eſſence, and only a numerical Difference; and ſo equal in all reſpects to one another: which ſeems to be the Doctrine of the *Athanaſian* Creed [b].

But this opinion was entangled with very great difficulties. At firſt, it ſeemed to contradict the words of Chriſt, when he declares,

Note XXIX [b] Cudworth, 602.

"The Father is greater than I." However, this difficulty they endeavoured to clear themselves from, by explaning the Words as if they related to the Humanity of Christ only; and he mean'd to inform his Disciples, that the eternal self-existent God was greater than a mere man born of a Woman; which, as Dr. *Cudworth* says, is by no means probable. Whereas *Athanasius*, *Basil*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, and *Chrysostom*, with several others of the *Latins*, interpret the same to have been spoken of the Divinity of Christ [c].

Again, this notion seemed to contradict the fundamental Articles of Christianity. For if Christ was immutable and impassible, he could not suffer; and if he was infinite, he was incapable of local motion, and could not *descend from Heaven to be Born*. To the first of these objections they answered; that he did not suffer in his divine, but in his human Nature: which shall be considered by and by. But to the second, they had no such subterfuge; but were obliged sometimes to assert it, and sometimes to deny it, as it served their purpose. The confusion or dishonesty of the Fathers after *Arius*'s time, in speaking of Christ sometimes as if he were unchangeable, impassible, invisible, and immense; and at other times as taking the form of a Servant, appearing in a human form, descending from Heaven, and suffering pain and death; is very remarkable. When they argued against the *Apollinarists*, they asserted; that the Divinity of Christ could not descend into Hell: because it was infinite, and consequently incapable of local motion; and afterwards, when they found the contrary Doctrine more to their purpose, argued that the Godhead did descend into Hell; accompanying his Soul thither [d]. Lastly, it planely followed from this System, that the three Hypostases being distinct and equal, must be three Gods; as *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, are three Men: (this objection the *Platonists* and *Athanasians* had foreseen and guarded against, by supposing the three Hypostases to be inseparably conjoined, and to have a mutual inbeing and circumincession; which they called by the word ἐμπεριχώρησις [e]. And therefore these learned Men, in defense of their Hypothesis, were obliged to maintain with their Logic, that three men are improperly called three, and are really and truly but one; because there is but one and the same specific Essence or Substance of Human Nature in them all: and

[c] Cudworth, 599. [d] Note XVIII. g. h. [e] Cudworth, 590. Note XVI. k.

seriously,

ſeriouſly perſuaded men to lay aſide that language[f]. And by the ſame reaſon, ſays Dr. *Cudworth*, all Men may be proved one Man; and all the Epicurean Gods one God.

To avoid this charge of believing three Gods, "When this "Trinity came afterwards to be charged as Tritheiſtic, [they "changed the Syſtem once more; and] in the room thereof, there "ſtarted up that other Trinity of *Perſons numerically* the ſame, as "having all one, and the ſame ſingular exiſtent Eſſence. A doc-"trine which, *Petavius* himſelf allows, was never entertained by the "*Nicene* Fathers, and the firſt oppoſers of *Arianiſm*; and Dr. *Cud-"worth* has proved it. And he ſays, it ſeemeth not to have been "owned by any public authority, ſave that of the *Lateran* Coun-"cil only[g]." And this Council was held ſo late as 1215; under *Innocent* the Third, the ſame Pope that eſtabliſhed Tranſubſtantia-tion; of whom Biſhop *Tonſtal* ſays, "He did not know what he "did, when he eſtabliſhed it; and that he had no learned Men "about him[h]." And Archbiſhop *Tillotſon* ſays, "Tranſubſtan-"tiation came in with Idolatry, and was made uſe of to ſupport it, "in the days of the groſſeſt Ignorance, Superſtition and Vice[i]." In ſhort, it was at a time; when "Many dignified Eccleſiaſtics "could not ſubſcribe the Canons of thoſe Councils, in which "they ſat as Members[k]." And the Pope himſelf has given us a notable inſtance of his infallibility in Critical Knowledge, in his Oration at the opening of the Council; in which he derives the word *Paſcha*, which is of *Hebrew* extraction, from the *Greek* word πάσχω *patior*[l]. Thus they changed from one extreme to the other: from Tritheiſm to the Epicurean Trinity[m], or the Trinity of the Schools; which Dr. *Cudworth* calls a *Sabellian* jar-gonry. The Author of it is ſaid to have been *Peter Lombard*, Archbiſhop of *Paris*, and Maſter of the Sentences, who died in 1164; though ſome ſay, it was invented by *Abelard* an *Unitarian*[n], which is not improbable; and though it was oppoſed by divers learned Men, and cenſured by *Alexander* the Third, and other Popes, it was declared Orthodox in the Fourth Council of *Lateran*[o]; in favour of *Peter Lombard*, and in oppoſition to Abbot *Joachim*:

[f] Cudworth, 604. [g] Ibid. 604. [h] Note XIX. [i] On Tranſubſtan-tiation. [k] Dr. Robertſon's Hiſtory of Charles the Fifth, Vol. i. p. 233. [l] Daillé, 49. [m] Note XXI. [n] Unitar. Tr. Colleƈt. ii. laſt Tr. [o] Note XX.

and is looked upon by the *Romaniſts* as the ſtandard of Orthodoxy. But the Proteſtants in this Country are much divided about it.

Hitherto the Orthodox, though they differed from one another in the particulars already mentioned, yet agreed in the main with the primitive Fathers; that the Chriſt, who ſuffered for Mankind, was a living Subſtance, diſtinct from the Father. Biſhop *Bull* tells us, that "It is moſt certain; the primitive Fathers, by the "*Logos*, or Word, who exiſted before the creation of the World, "and by whom the World was made, did not underſtand any power "*(virtutem)* of God, unſubſtantial, [ἀνυπόστατον] but a living "and ſubſiſting Word, which we commonly call Perſon. And it "is equally certain; that thoſe primitive Fathers held, that the "Word was a Perſon diſtinct from God the Father, and the Holy "Spirit[p]." But by the Decree of this Council, this Faith was entirely altered; for it does not ſuppoſe the Word to be a diſtinct Subſiſtence from the Father, or a living Agent differing from him in Number; but merely a Power, or a Virtue, or a mode of Exiſtence: and ſo it ſeems to be believed by moſt of the reformed Churches[q].

Mr. *Richard Baxter*, in his Church Hiſtory, tells us; that *Peter Lombard*'s Opinion, adopted by the *Lateran* Council, was this: *Quædam ſumma res, Pater, Filius, & Spiritus S. nec generans, nec genita, nec procedens.* Inſtead therefore of obviating the objection to the former notion of the Trinity, that it ſuppoſed *three* Gods; this Council ſeems to have made it very uncertain, whether there are not *four*. For if this Being, this *una ſumma res*, did neither beget, nor was begotten, nor proceeded; it ſhould ſeem that he muſt be neither Father, Son, nor Holy Ghoſt: but ſomething different from them all.

Let us now conſider, whether by the deciſion of this Council, the Moderns are brought to agree in their Orthodoxy, better than the Ancients. Dr. *South*, Dr. *Wallis*, Mr. *Hooker*, and the Schoolmen, who are called Nominals, becauſe they do not believe the Three Perſons to be real Subſiſtences, but merely Names, Attributes, modes of Exiſtence, Relations, Properties, States, or Poſtures; explane themſelves as follows.

Some repreſent the Three Perſons, as Three Acts of God, whereby he is denominated according to Three different Characters or

[p] Bull. de Jeſ. Chriſti Divin. 17.

[q] See Note XX. XXII.

Perſons;

Persons; (as the word *Persona* is used by *Cicero*[r]) as a Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier. Others say, the three Persons are not mere Acts; but the Attributes of Goodness, Wisdom, and Power; or Three relative Subsistences: but so that their Subsistence is nothing else but their Relation, as the same Man may be said to sustain the Three Persons of a Father, a Son, and a Husband.

To these are opposed the *Realists*; who understand Person in the common acceptation of the word, as Archbishop *Tillotson* expresses himself; and believe the different Persons, to be different Subsistences, Minds, or Spirits; of which opinion were Archbishop *Tillotson*, Bishop *Bull*, Bishop *Fowler*, Dr. *Cudworth*, *Episcopius*, Dr. *Sherlock*, Mr. *How*, Dr. *Clarke*, Dr. *Waterland*, &c. and many of these make no scruple to contemn and ridicule the *Nominals*. Mr. *How* calls *Peter Lombard*, one of the Four Evangelists of Antichrist; and Bishop *Fowler* thinks, they will only make sport for the *Socinians*; Dr. *Cudworth* calls their Notions, the Philosophy of *Gotham*, and *Sabellian* jargonry; and Dr. *Sherlock* says, "To say "there are Three divine Persons, and not Three distinct infinite "Minds, is both Heresy and Nonsense—They are Three Intelligent "Beings—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are as really distinct Persons "as *Peter*, *James* and *John*—We must allow the Divine Persons "to be real Substantial Beings—The Three Divine Beings are "Substantially distinct[s]."

On the other side, at the University of *Oxford*, [*November* 25, 1695] Mr. Vice Chancellor, with the Heads of the Colleges and Halls, in a General Meeting, judged and decree'd the Principles of the Realists [viz. *That there are Three infinite distinct Minds and Substances in the Trinity, and that the three Persons in the Trinity are three distinct infinite Minds*;] to be false, impious, heretical, contrary to the Doctrine of the Catholic Church, and especially of the Church of *England*[t].

To which the *Realists* answer; that, "What the *Oxford* Heads "have condemned as heretical and impious, is the very Catholic "Faith: and that this Decree, or Declaration, censures the *Nicene* "Faith, and the Faith of the Church of *England*, as Heresy; and "exposes both to the Scorn and Triumph of the *Socinians*[u]." And

[r] De Offic. l. 1. c. 30. 32. [s] Sherlock's Vindication of the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, p. 105. and 47. Unit. Tr. Vol. iv. Tr. [illegible] [t] Unit. Tr. Vol. iv. Tr. [illegible] p. 3. [u] Ibid. Vol. v. Tr. v. p. 23.

Dr.

Dr. *Sherlock* says, I will undertake, any day in the year, to procure a Meeting of twice as many as wise and learned men to confute their Decree.

It seems therefore, that the Church of *England* has not yet settled this important Article; nor determined any where in express Words, whether there is in truth one infinite Mind, for which belief *Van Pere* was burn'd in *Smithfield*; or whether there are three infinite Minds, (*tres spiritus substantiali numero differentes*) for which belief *Val. Gentilis* was beheaded by the Protestant Senate of *Bern*. And she has great Reason to applaud her own Wisdom, in leaving this matter as she found it; whether she considers in what a miserable manner the other Christian Churches have explained it; (*Cudworth*, 605) or the divisions and animosities, which a determination either way would have caused.

✓ See note XXII

Besides this difference between the *Realists* and *Nominals*, whether there be three infinite Minds that govern the Universe, or one only; the *Realists* differ no less among themselves: one Party believes the three Minds or Persons to be every way equal, and that each One is equal to all Three; because, if *either* were imperfect, *he* could not be *God*. To which their adversaries reply; If they be *all equally perfect*, they must be *three Gods*; for the same Reason that *each* must be infinitely perfect, to be *one* God.

Upon this account most of the learned moderns object to the Equality as Tritheistic, and suppose the Son and Spirit to be inferior to the Father in all things; but only this: that they are coeternal, and have all the Divine Attributes that are communicable; not of Themselves, but from the Father. *Episcopius*[x], and Dr. *Cudworth*[y], largely defend this; and condemn those of undeniable Tritheism, who make the Son and Spirit in all things equal to the Father; and these are followed by *Clarke*, *Jackson*, &c.

But to this the other *Realists* answer; that, if the Son and Spirit be subordinate, then either the Father only is God; or else there is one great God, and two inferior Ones.

To this it is replied; that, the Word *God* is used in the Scripture in different Senses: that, when Christ is called God; it does not mean the self-existent God; but his Son. For if he was the self-existent God, he would not be the Son of God, but the

[x] Episc. Institut. L. 4. c. 38. [y] Intel. Syst. 303, 304.

Father

Father himself; or rather, there would be neither Father nor Son: and if he was both, he must be his own Father and his own Son.

The other *Realists* look upon this to be no better than *Arianism*; and contend, in their different Schemes; some of them, that the three Persons are one God, by a close Union of their Substances; others say, by a mutual Consciousness to one another's Thoughts and Actions; and others, because they are in one another by a kind of *Emperichoresis*.

To all which their adversaries, both *Realists* and *Nominals*, answer; that the manner in which the Three Persons exist, is not the question. If they are each of them Almighty, Omniscient, and Perfect God, they must be Three perfect Gods; whether they be mutually conscious or not, whether in or out of one another, whether united or disunited; except they be so united as to be one and the same: which is *Sabellianism*.

The arguments therefore are the same now, as at the Council of *Nice*: and the Doctrine of the Three Persons and one God is subscribed to by the *Realists* and *Nominals*, as the word Ὁμοούσιος was then by the *Athanasians* and *Sabellians*; the difference in Opinion being much the same. For we are told by *Socrates* the Historian[s], that "After the Council of *Nice*, the Bishops wrangled "about the Word Ὁμοούσιος and those that were for it, were censured "by the contrary party as *Sabellians*, and were called impious, because "they destroyed the real existence of the Son;" [which is the very accusation the *Realists* now bring against the *Nominals*, for supposing the Son and Spirit to be only modes of Existence, or Names of the Father;] "and those that were against Ὁμοούσιος, were con- "demned by such as were for it, as reviving Gentilism or the "Belief of more Gods;" [which is the same accusation, that the *Nominals* now bring against the *Realists*:] so that the difficulties are now just the same, as they were at the Council of *Nice*; and no more likely to be settled. See Unit. Tracts, Vol. I. Tract the last. Bulli Op. 28.

This appears to be the present State of the Controversy in the Christian Church; and consequently the question, what is Orthodoxy, or where it is to be found; is as difficult to answer, as ever it was. It is indeed extremely easy to be Orthodox in *Words*; because the same Creeds have been always kept up in the Church,

[s] Lib. i. c. 23. Bulli Op. p. 28. Note XXIII

what-

Dr. *Sherlock* says, I will undertake, any day in the year, to procure a Meeting of twice as many as wise and learned men to consute their Decree.

It seems therefore, that the Church of *England* has not yet settled this important Article; nor determined any where in express Words, whether there is in truth one infinite Mind, for which belief *Van Pere* was burn'd in *Smithfield*; or whether there are three infinite Minds, *(tres spiritus substantiali numero differentes)* for which belief *Val. Gentilis* was beheaded by the Protestant Senate of *Bern*. And she has great Reason to applaud her own Wisdom, in leaving this matter as she found it; whether she considers in what a miserable manner the other Christian Churches have explained it; *(Cudworth*, 605) or the divisions and animosities, which a determination either way would have caused.

✓ See note XXII

Besides this difference between the *Realists* and *Nominals*, whether there be three infinite Minds that govern the Universe, or one only; the *Realists* differ no less among themselves: one Party believes the three Minds or Persons to be every way equal, and that each One is equal to all Three; because, if *either* were imperfect, *he* could not be *God*. To which their adversaries reply; If they be *all equally perfect*, they must be *three Gods*; for the same Reason that *each* must be infinitely perfect, to be *one* God.

Upon this account most of the learned moderns object to the Equality as Tritheistic, and suppose the Son and Spirit to be inferior to the Father in all things; but only this: that they are coeternal, and have all the Divine Attributes that are communicable; not of Themselves, but from the Father. *Episcopius*[z], and Dr. *Cudworth*[y], largely defend this; and condemn those of undeniable Tritheism, who make the Son and Spirit in all things equal to the Father; and these are followed by *Clarke*, *Jackson*, &c.

But to this the other *Realists* answer; that, if the Son and Spirit be subordinate, then either the Father only is God; or else there is one great God, and two inferior Ones.

To this it is replied; that, the Word *God* is used in the Scripture in different Senses; that, when Christ is called God; it does not mean the self-existent God; but his Son. For if he was the self-existent God, he would not be the Son of God, but the

[z] Episc. Institut. L. 4. c. 3.

[y] Intel. Syst. 303, 304.

Father

Father himself; or rather, there would be neither Father nor Son: and if he was both, he must be his own Father and his own Son.

The other *Realists* look upon this to be no better than *Arianism*; and contend, in their different Schemes; some of them, that the three Persons are one God, by a close Union of their Substances; others say, by a mutual Consciousness to one another's Thoughts and Actions; and others, because they are in one another by a kind of *Emperichoresis*.

To all which their adversaries, both *Realists* and *Nominals*, answer; that the manner in which the Three Persons exist, is not the question. If they are each of them Almighty, Omniscient, and Perfect God, they must be Three perfect Gods; whether they be mutually conscious or not, whether in or out of one another, whether united or disunited; except they be so united as to be one and the same: which is *Sabellianism*.

The arguments therefore are the same now, as at the Council of *Nice*: and the Doctrine of the Three Persons and one God is subscribed to by the *Realists* and *Nominals*, as the word Ὁμοούσιος was then by the *Athanasians* and *Sabellians*; the difference in Opinion being much the same. For we are told by *Socrates* the Historian [z], that "After the Council of *Nice*, the Bishops wrangled "about the Word Ὁμοούσιος and those that were for it, were censured "by the contrary party as *Sabellians*, and were called impious, because "they destroyed the real existence of the Son;" [which is the very accusation the *Realists* now bring against the *Nominals*, for supposing the Son and Spirit to be only modes of Existence, or Names of the Father;] "and those that were against Ὁμοούσιος, were con-"demned by such as were for it, as reviving Gentilism or the "Belief of more Gods;" [which is the same accusation, that the *Nominals* now bring against the *Realists*:] so that the difficulties are now just the same, as they were at the Council of *Nice*; and no more likely to be settled. See Unit. Tracts, Vol. I. Tract the last. Bulli Op. 28.

This appears to be the present State of the Controversy in the Christian Church; and consequently the question, what is Orthodoxy, or where it is to be found; is as difficult to answer, as ever it was. It is indeed extremely easy to be Orthodox in *Words*; because the same Creeds have been always kept up in the Church,

[z] Lib. i. c. 23. Bulli Op. p. 28. Note XXIII

what-

whatever Party got uppermoſt; though they ſo often changed their Faith. But to know the true Orthodox ſenſe of thoſe Creeds, has been thereby rendered more difficult than ever. If the words Conſubſtantial and Perſon, had no determinate ſenſe at the Council of *Nice*; how can we ever expect to aſcertain it now? and if Conſubſtantial may mean generical as well as identical Subſtance, and Perſon may mean either an Attribute or a Subſiſtence; what can prevent honeſt Men of the moſt oppoſite Notions, from ſubſcribing to the ſame Words; which ſome People have ſo much wondered at? Hence it happens; that, as on the one hand it is extremely difficult for any Party to draw up a ſet of Words, as an Article of Faith which they themſelves believe; that their Adverſaries may not alſo fairly ſubſcribe to: ſo on the other hand it is almoſt impoſſible to make ſuch a Confeſſion of Faith, as is not capable of being interpreted into Hereſy. To prove the firſt of theſe aſſertions, let us conſider the diſpute between *Neſtorius* and *Cyril*; about two Natures in one Perſon. Here the word *Perſon* was capable of at leſt *ten* ſenſes, and the word *Nature* of *nine*; (See Note IV. c. 2.). The propoſition therefore might be underſtood in *ninety* different Senſes; and conſequently, there might be *ninety* Subſcribers to the ſame Words, and not *two* of them of the ſame opinion. An inſtance of the latter aſſertion, may be obſerved in the Doctrine of Three Perſons, and one God; which might be interpreted to mean Three equally ſupreme Minds, and be called Tritheiſtic; or three unequal Minds; or one ſupreme Mind under Three Denominations; and be called *Sabellian*. Every man therefore is liable to be cenſured as a Heretic, if his Eccleſiaſtical Judge differs from him in Opinion; let his Belief be what it will.

In conſidering all theſe opinions, maintained by ſuch as have been looked upon to be Orthodox, we ſee the great difficulty of determining, where to expect the Truth. "As far as the Scriptures "have determined it; to wit, that there is Father, a Son, and a "Spirit, and that there is but one God; and that Chriſt is in ſome "places called God, and ſaid to be *(ἓν, unum)* one thing with the "Father, is agree'd to by all Denominations; whether *Arians*, "*Socinians*, or Orthodox. But each of theſe, and many more, "have ſet themſelves to work, to contrive a ſcheme to reconcile "the difficulty, how theſe Three are One. Now as the Scriptures "have no ~~way~~ what determined this Point; all the Solutions of it by

"One

"*One Eſſence, One Subſtance, One in Will,* or *Power*; &c. are "juſtly to be looked-upon as ſo many ſeveral Hypotheſes to ſolve a "Phænomenon by[a]:" and not any wicked deſign to blaſpheme or diſhonour God or his Son; but a pious intent to explane his Revelation in a conſiſtent manner. And each of them being purely Human, the invention of Men; no Man can have a right to declare his own opinion to be the Doctrine of the Trinity, any more than every other man who differs from him. 'Tis impious and preſumptuous to do it: much leſs has any man a right to accuſe his adverſary, of *denying or oppoſing the ever bleſſed Trinity*; becauſe he rejects as unſcriptural his particular Account or Solution. For what one Chriſtian conſiders as a moſt venerable and awful Myſtery; another, equally ſincere, may look-upon as no better than Superſtition and Blaſphemy. Did *Athanaſius* deny the Trinity, becauſe he differed from *Origen*? or *Cyril*, becauſe he differed from *Athanaſius*? or *Petavius*, becauſe he differed from *Cyril*: or *Clarke*, *Pearſon*, *How*, *Wallis*, *South*, *Bennet*, *Burnet*, *Sherlock*; &c. becauſe they differed from one another? or *Waterland*, becauſe he formed a ſyſtem different from all that went before him? Surely by no means; every one had a right to underſtand the Doctrine, as he thought was moſt agreable to Scripture: but not one of them to impoſe his opinion upon other men. And therefore I ſhall not look upon it as a ſufficient argument, that the Hypotheſis of Dr. *Waterland* is the true Orthodox Hypotheſis; merely becauſe it is generally eſpouſed by thoſe, who now call themſelves by that name: but examine it with the ſame liberty that I ſhould take with the ſyſtems of *Origen* or *Cyril*. For if his metaphyſical account of the Meſſiah of the Chriſtians, contradicts the deſcription of the Meſſiah which is given by the Prophets; it will be incumbent upon me, either to reject Chriſtianity; or to ſhew, that his account is not agreable to the Chriſtian Revelation.

And therefore, I ſhall now conſider the Doctrine of the Trinity, as laid-down by Dr. *Waterland*, and ſeveral other modern writers; who, in many particulars of great moment, differ from one another; All of them from the moſt ancient Fathers, and from the *Nicene* Council, and eſpecially from *Athanaſius*; and yet affect, one and all, to defend their notions under the authority of *His* name.

The *Nicene* Fathers ſuppoſed the Three Perſons in the Trinity to

[a] Sykes on the External Peace of the Church *Pag.*

be joined together inſeparably; as the Sun and its Light, the Fountain and its River, the Tree and its Branches: to which was added an *Emperichoreſis*[a]. *Cyril* and others, on the contrary, believed the three Perſons to be ſeparate and diſtinct Beings; but each of himſelf to be God and Lord[b]: as *Thomas*, *John* and *William*, are Three ſeparate and diſtinct Men. The *Lateran* Council, contrary to both of theſe opinions, maintained a ſingularity of Subſtance in the Three Perſons; *viz.* That there was but one and the ſame ſingular Subſtance to them all. Theſe, as I obſerved, were all reckoned Orthodox, at different times; and a fourth Hypotheſis can hardly be conceived. So the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians*, that they might be ſure to be in the right ſomewhere, maintein them all together; though abſolutely contradictory to one another: and the laſt of them is particularly condemned by *Athanaſius* himſelf; as being the Doctrine of *Sabellius*[c].

This ſyſtem I ſhall the more thoroughly examine, becauſe it is looked upon by many to be the ſtandard of Orthodoxy; and includes in it the great objection to Chriſtianity, which was made to *St. Auguſtine* by *Voluſianus*, *utrum Dominus & Rector Mundi inter Corpuſculum vagientis Infantiæ latet; cui parva putatur Univerſitas*: Whether the ſupreme Governor of the World was ſhut-up in the Child Jeſus; of which Dr. *Meric Caſaubon* ſays, in his Opinion it contains an objection againſt Chriſtianity, the moſt conſiderable in point of credibility that ever was or can be made; and which hath kept more people from embracing the Chriſtian Faith, than any other that he knew of; whereof many inſtances might be given. (Of credulity and incredulity, p. 118.) And I may add; it is at preſent the chief cauſe of Deiſm in this Country, by rendering the Chriſtian Scriptures utterly unintelligible; and muſt be the moſt inſurmountable obſtacle to the Converſion both of the Jews and Mahometans; as indeed it had long been to Myſelf.

Theſe *Pſeudo-Athanaſians*, as far as I can underſtand them, ſeem to maintein——

1. That the *Logos*, or Word of God; and *that God*, with whom he was in the beginning, and *whoſe Son* he is; and the Holy Spirit, who procedes from them both; are, each of them *ſingly*, the One Supreme God: [whole and entire; though ſome deny this:] and yet the Three *all together* are the ſame Supreme God.

[a] Cudworth, 590. [b] Athanaſian Creed. [c] Note VIII.

2. They hold, that the ſame One Supreme God, who is Infinite, and conſequently incapable of Local Motion, came down from Heaven. He, that is Immutable, quitted the form of God, and took upon him the form of a Servant, and was made Man, i. e. he was joined to a *Soul and Body*; but it was neither the *Father* nor the *Holy Spirit*, that was joined to Man; but only the *Son*: notwithſtanding which, the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt are inſeparably united; ſo that the Subſtance of the Son may be juſtly called the Father's Subſtance, being *una ſumma res*[a].

3. They aſſert, that the divine and human Nature, thus joined together, is Chriſt; and that Chriſt ſuffered for Mankind, and yet it was not both the divine and human Nature [or, as the *Athanaſian* Creed expreſſes it, *God and Man which is one Chriſt*] that ſuffered, but only the human Nature; the divine Nature, which came down from Heaven, being the Subſtance of the impaſſible ſelf-exiſtent Being; and conſequently incapable of ſuffering. Notwithſtanding which, it was the Supreme God that ſuffered; and the Blood of Chriſt was the Blood of the Supreme God; "Supreme in the "ſtricteſt ſenſe, God in the ſame ſenſe, and in as high a ſenſe as "the Father himſelf;" and received its Worth from being the Blood of *God*: and thereby made ſatisfaction, to the ſame God, for the ſins of the whole World: which it could not have done, had it only been the Blood of Man, and not the Blood of God. Notwithſtanding which, the Deity ſuffered not at all; being impaſſible. All theſe inſurmountable difficulties they run into, in order to ſupport a notion for which they have no proof; *viz.* That it is impoſſible for God himſelf to create a Being, with power to create inferior Beings; or to give him ſuch power afterwards: or to command a Being, who is not the Supreme God of the Univerſe, to be worſhipped, to the glory of the Supreme God, by thoſe over whom he hath made him Lord and King. Becauſe, ſay they, it would be Idolatry. Thus the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians*, as well as the other Sects, have taken-up their Tenets out of a good deſign; and run into their errors, in order to avoid what they think more derogatory from the honour of God than the principles they profeſs.

Theſe opinions, taken altogether, are not properly a ſingle Hereſy; but a complication of Hereſies and Contradictions: by means of which the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians* anſwer the objections which are

[a] Waterland. Nott. K. Def. p. 379. 380. 381.

brought against them, sometimes as *Tritheists*, sometimes as *Sabellians*, sometimes as *Socinians*, &c.

When it is objected to them; that, if Christ be the Supreme God, he is not capable of *suffering*; and that, to suppose the Supreme God to suffer, is the Heresy of *Sabellius* and the *Patripassians*; they answer, that he suffered in his Human nature only; and the Divine nature did not suffer at all: which is the same thing as to say in other words, that it was only a Man, or the Man Jesus, that suffered; which is the Heresy of *Socinus* and *Cerinthus*.

On the other hand, if it be objected, that, to suppose it to be a mere Man that suffered, is the Doctrine of *Socinus* and *Cerinthus*; they answer, that the Person who suffered was not a mere Man, but the Second Person of the Trinity; and consequently, the Supreme God; which is the Heresy of *Sabellius*, and a direct contradiction to the former answer: for, if the Human Nature only suffered, the Second Person of the Trinity did not suffer; for the Human nature is not the Second Person of the Trinity, but the Divine nature.

If it be farther objected; that it is Tritheism, to believe Three Persons to be each of them Supreme God; they answer, as the *Sabellians* do, that they are *all together* but one God. And, on the other hand, if it be objected; that it is *Sabellianism*, to believe the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be all together but One God, for as much as such a notion destroys the Personality of the Son and Holy Ghost; they answer, *they believe the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are three distinct Persons, and each of them by himself Supreme God*; which is Tritheism. And if they be pressed with this objection, that the belief of Three distinct Persons, each of them Supreme God, is Tritheism; they answer, that these Three Persons, who are each of them *separately* Supreme God, are *all together* but One God; which is either direct *Sabellianism*, in supposing the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be but One Person; or else a contradiction in terms, in allowing Three Persons, to be *each of them* a Supreme God, and yet *all together* but one Supreme God[f].

Thus they absolve themselves from one Heresy; by professing another, which is quite opposite to it; and holding two or more Doctrines at the same time, which are absolutely contradictory to

[f] Note [illegible] XXIX

each

each other. And therefore it is no wonder, if they differ as much among themselves, as they do from their Adversaries.

Dr. *Waterland* tells us, that God is sometimes considered *personally*, with relation and opposition to the Son and Holy Ghost; and sometimes *essentially*, as comprehending the whole Trinity [g]: but Bishop *Pearson*, in opposition to this vain distinction, (as He calls it,) argues, that if the Son were included in the Father, then were the Son the Father to himself [h]. They differ no less, in their notions of the Generation of the Son [i]. And Bishop *Stillingfleet* tells us, the Enemies of the Trinity have mentioned Five Trinities; which he enumerates [k]: and, in the Second Collection of Unitarian Tracts, mention is made of Forty Particulars, in which the Orthodox differ from one another [l].

These Doctrines of the *Pseudo-Athanasians*, do, in their consequences, strike at the very fundamental Principles of all natural and reveled Religion; as I shall procede to shew. But it will be proper in the first place to initiate you into the Mysteries of the new invented Metaphysics, by which they are defended.

It is obvious to the common Sense of all Mankind; that, if there be any quality or attribute existing, as hardness, softness, goodness, righteousness; it must belong to, or be the attribute of something: that is, there must be some *Thing*, or *Being*, that is hard, soft, good, or righteous: you may call it what you please, either Substratum, Substance, Essence, or Nature; but there must be *something* in which the property exists [m]. Sir *Isaac Newton* has expressed this Truth very concisely, as an Axiom; *Virtus sine Substantia subsistere non potest* [n].—Now, if the Substance be unintelligent, in which the quality exists; we call it a Thing, or *Substance*; but if it be intelligent, we call it a *Person*; meaning by the word *Person* to distinguish a Thing or *Substance* that is intelligent, from a Thing or *Substance* that is not intelligent. By the word Person, we therefore mean a Thing or Substance that is intelligent; or a conscious Being: including in the Word, the Idea both of the Substance and its Properties together.

But the *Pseudo-Athanasians*, in order to defend their System, make use of the word in so many different Senses; as only serves

[g] Waterland, 349. quoted in Jackson's Reply, 438. [h] Pearson on the Creed, p. 32. [i] Note VII. [k] Note XXI. [l] Unitar. Tracts, Vol. ii. p. 8.
[m] Note XXIV [n] Newton's Prin. Schol. Gen. 483.

to

to amuse and confound us. Sometimes, meaning an intelligent Substance; at other times, dividing the Substance from the Person; as when Bishop *Pearson* tells us, that Christ was buffeted and scourged; and no other Person was sensible of those Pains, but the eternal Word; and yet the divine Essence suffered not: And at other times they tell us, that all the attributes of God are really the same; not only with themselves, but with the Essence[a]; and that the Life, and Power, and Wisdom of Christ are the same with his Essence: and consequently, the Person of Christ may signify either his Essence or his Attributes. But such an uncertain Language can only lead us into confusion. Nor will these arbitrary Metaphysics, which have no foundation in Scripture or Nature, be sufficient to support their Theory. For,

1st. If the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, be each of them Supreme God, in the highest sense of the Word[b]; as Dr. *Waterland* mainteins: then it follows, that the Son and Holy Spirit are unoriginate and self-existent, as well as the Father; and consequently, if they are distinct Persons, they must be three self-existent Gods: which is direct Tritheism. But if they be not distinct Persons, but One Person; then the Son and Holy Ghost are only different names of the one self-existent Person of the Father, and have no real or personal Existence of themselves: which is *Sabellianism*.

2dly. But if they be supposed to be Supreme, in the highest sense of the word, and yet not self-existent; (which is a contradiction, and yet seems to be the meaning of these Writers[c]) still there will be Three Supreme Persons, and Three Supreme Governors of the Universe; that is, in other words, Three Gods: whereof One is self-existent and unoriginate, and the other Two not so. And, if they exist in one Substance, (as they suppose,) they will be Three Supreme Gods in one Substance; or, if they exist in Three Substances, they will be Three Supreme Gods in Three Substances? For the Existence of Three Supreme Persons in the One Substance of the Father, (which they suppose,) will no more make them the One Supreme God; than it will make them the One Supreme Father[d]. If it does the one, it will do the other.

[a] Pearson, p. 39, and in p. 27, and 137, Notes; and Dr. Waterland speaks of the Will of God as God himself, as if Will were a real Being. Def. 227. Jackson, 439.

[b] Supreme in the highest Sense, God in the same, and in as high a Sense as the Father himself. 53. 57. quoted by Jackson p. 55. 182.

[c] Jackson, 438.

3dly.

3dly: All that the *Pseudo-Athanasians* can pretend to conclude, from supposing the Son to be of the same Substance with the Father, is only this; that He is God, as to his Substance; but, as they divide the Substance from the Person, and suppose the Person to be originate; it does not at all prove him to be a divine *Person*, or object of Worship. And of this they seem to be conscious. For why do they assert, the Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, and yet deny, that there are three Gods? The reason is; that, according to their System, they suppose the Substance to be One and the same in all Three; and the Godhead or Deity to consist in the Substance. And therefore a Unity of Substance being supposed, they conclude that these Three are One God; because there is only one Essence or Substance among them.—But this will not be the case, if they assert the Persons to be each of them God; for, on this Supposition, there would be no Unity at all; each of the Persons being supposed a distinct and different Person, ἄλλη καὶ ἄλλη, as the *Athanasian* Creed says: so that the unavoidable consequence of such an opinion, that each Person by himself is God as to his Person, must be a belief of Three Gods.

Besides, their argument that Christ is not God, except his Substance be the very Substance of the Father; if it proves any thing, will prove too much: *viz.* that he is not God in his Person, except he be the very Person of the Father. And it is as much Idolatry to worship a Person not self-existent, as They do; as it is to worship a Substance not self-existent, as it is said their Adversaries do: and consequently, the *Pseudo-Athanasians* are as much Idolaters; in worshipping the Son and Holy Spirit, whose Persons they believe not self-existent; as their Adversaries are, in worshipping the same Persons; while they believe their Substances not self-existent. For if all the Beings in the Universe were to exist in the divine Substance, as the τὸ πᾶν· (as *Lactantius* seems to imagine, when he says, in *eo simul & filius & omnia continentur*;) they would not therefore be each of them the One Supreme God; but that Person or intelligent Being only, whose Intelligence and Consciousness, as well as his Substance, is unoriginate and self-existent. For what we worship is an intelligent Being: It is neither a Nature, nor an Essence, nor a Substance, nor an Attribute, simply considered: but a *Person*; that is, a Moral Agent; a conscious intelligent Substance: and therefore, if we direct our Worship to Three Supreme distinct Moral Agents or Persons, we

worship

worſhip Three diſtinct Gods; whether their Subſtance be the ſame or not: and the Worſhip of Three diſtinct Supreme Agents, as Governors of the Univerſe, deſtroys the Monarchy of God the Father; and is equally Tritheiſm, whether they be ſuppoſed to exiſt in One Subſtance or in Three.

But if they aſſert the Subſtance and the Attributes to be the ſame thing, according to Biſhop *Pearſon*; the matter is full as bad. For as there can be no meaning to the word Perſon, which is not included in the Eſſence and Attributes taken together; if the Eſſence be the ſame Thing as the Attributes, then the Perſon muſt be included in the Eſſence, or the Attributes, taken ſingly. And conſequently, if God and Chriſt be of the ſame Eſſence or Attributes, they muſt be the ſame Perſon; which is *Sabellianiſm*.

Or thus: If the Subſtance and Attributes be the ſame Thing, and Chriſt be of the ſame Subſtance with the Father: he muſt alſo have the ſame Attributes; and conſequently be ſelf-exiſtent and unbegotten. On the contrary, if the Son is begotten, and the Father is of the ſame Subſtance; the Father alſo muſt be begotten; becauſe it is an Attribute of the Son to be begotten: and conſequently neither of them is begotten or unbegotten, and there is neither Father nor Son; or elſe each of them is both Father and Son, begotten and unbegotten.

But farther, if the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians* worſhip the whole Chriſt, whom they allow to be both God and Man; they worſhip a compound Being, one part originate and the other unoriginate, one human and the other divine; and therefore, according to their own Principles, are as much guilty of Idolatry, as the *Arians*. And this is the Caſe of all ſuch among them, as worſhip the Chriſt as Mediator; or the Humanity as united to the Divinity; of which *Athanaſius* is one, who in *Pſalm.* 99. 5. explanes *Worſhip ye his Footſtool*, to ſignify Worſhip the human Nature of Chriſt. (*Emlyn*'s Tracts, p. 107.) If they worſhip Chriſt as God and Man, they worſhip the Creature as well as the Creator.

The Agreement of the Fathers in this reſpect may be ſeen in *Forbeſii Inſtitut. Theol.* and Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s Defenſe againſt *Godden*. The former of theſe ſcruples not to ſay of Jeſus Chriſt, *Adorandus, inquam, ſine excluſione carnis ab objecto ſeu termino adorationis*: and he ends the Chapter with this concluſion and judgment of the Fathers; *Unica & ſola ratio, propter quam humanitas Chriſti latria*

ſoli

soli Deo debita, absque Idolatriæ crimine a nobis colitur, est unio Hypostatica: i.e. the only reason why we worship the human Nature of Christ, with that worship which is alone due to God, and yet without Idolatry, is the personal Union to the Divinity. And thus Dr. *Owen*; the human Nature, in the Person of the divine, and together with it, is the object of all Worship and Adoration: and no other Creature.

Thus the *Athanasians* themselves worship a Creature, in the very same Act, in which they worship the divine Nature. "And "it is a vain thing, says Mr. *Emlyn*, to think to excuse themselves "by saying, they do not worship the Humanity for itself; but as, "and because it is united to the Divinity: since as that Union does "not change the human Nature into a divine Nature, so neither "does it hinder their Worship from being a Creature-worship." *Emlyn*, Vol. I. p. 107, &c.

Bishop *Bull* says; "When the Humanity of Christ is adored, "the Creature is not so adored, but that the Act reaches to the "Creator, who joined the created Nature to himself in the Unity "of Person." Be it so; yet still the Humanity is adored, i. e. a Creature: and not at all the less, because the Creator is adored also. And as to the Act reaching to the Creator, so did the worship of God by Images. *Athanasius* says; "Though the Flesh be of itself a "part of created things, yet it is made the Body of God.—We "adore not the Creature; but God, clothed in a created Body." If this be the Case, the Mediator is not adored at all; and how does this agree with worshipping the human Nature, as he explanes *Psalm* 99. 5. See Bulli Op. p. 57.—And suppose the created Flesh could be made the Body of God, yet still it would be a created Body; and the Worship of it, the Worship of a creature.

A fourth Objection to this amazing notion, that the Messiah is the Supreme God, is this: that it makes him incapable of performing those Actions, and undergoing those Sufferings; which are foretold in our Prophecies, and recorded in the New Testament, to be actually performed by him; contradicting all those Texts of Scripture, which declare him to be sent by the Father to do his will, as he gave him Commandment; and that he suffered and died, and was rewarded. For if the Substance of the Son be the self-existent Substance of the Father, (in which the *Pseudo-Athanasians* imagine the Godhead or Divinity to consist;) then the Son was not

capable of coming into the World, or being ſent: for how can that Subſtance be capable of moving from one place to another, which fills all ſpace at the ſame time? Much leſs can he be capable of Incarnation: for nothing can be more abſurd, than to imagine that Subſtance, which the Heaven of Heavens cannot contain, to be confined in the human Body; and yet *Juſtin Martyr* tells us plainly the Doctrine of his age, *viz.* That he came down from Heaven; that he might be born Man of the Virgin *Mary*. *Dial.* 2d. p. 378. *Lond.* Ed. And if it were only a part of the divine Subſtance, which was the Notion of *Tertullian* and the *Montaniſts*; then the ſelf-exiſtent Subſtance muſt be divided: which is contrary to the *Pſeudo-Athanaſian* ſyſtem.

If it be ſaid; that it was not the Subſtance, but only the Perſon of the Son which was Incarnate; (as if the Perſon could be ſeparate from the Subſtance:) then it follows, upon the *Pſeudo-Athanaſian* Theory, that the Perſon who was Incarnate was not God; for they confine the Divinity to the Subſtance or Eſſence. And as Chriſt could not be ſent by the Father, nor be Incarnate; if he were God, of the ſame identical Subſtance with the Father; becauſe the infinite Subſtance is incapable of local motion and confinement: So neither could he ſuffer and die, and be rewarded. But all theſe things are predicated of Chriſt, in the Chriſtian Scriptures; and yet not one of them can, without Blaſphemy, be predicated of God the Father of the Univerſe; who is incapable of them: and conſequently, the Chriſtian Scriptures cannot admit of this Doctrine; that Chriſt is the Supreme God.

To obviate this difficulty in ſome meaſure, it is ſaid: that Chriſt is *both* the Supreme God, and *alſo* Man; that in him God and Man were *united*. So that he had *two* Natures in *one* Perſon; the divine Nature, as God; and the human Nature, as Man; the one impaſſible, the other paſſible; and therefore, though he could not ſuffer, as God; he was capable of ſuffering, as Man.

This notion, though now held by many; yet, when thoroughly examined, will appear to agree entirely with the Hereſies of *Cerinthus* and *Socinus*, in the main point; *viz.* That no other Being ſuffered, but a mere Man. For though the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians* do not now ſay with *Cerinthus*, that the divine Perſon who deſcended from Heaven left the Man *Jeſus* before his Paſſion; nor with *Socinus*, that Chriſt was a mere Man; yet they agree with both, that the ſufferings

ſufferings were not undergone, i. e. were not felt, by that divine Being that came down from Heaven; whom they ſuppoſe to be impaſſible: And conſequently no other Being ſuffered but a Man.

To extricate themſelves from this difficulty, it was ſaid by *Hilary*, that he ſuffered, but was inſenſible of Pain[r]. But this is a palpable contradiction: for without a ſenſe of Pain there can be no Suffering. And therefore it was thought more proper to ſay, that Chriſt ſuffered in the human Nature only; which is an expreſſion not ſo eaſily ſeen through, but in fact the ſame thing: For it ſuppoſes the Perſon who came down from Heaven, to ſuffer in ſuch a manner; that the ſenſation of pain fell only upon the human Nature: which was not the Perſon that came down from Heaven, but a mere Man. For Nature, in the ſtricteſt ſenſe of the Word, is only an abſtract Idea; and incapable of ſuffering, as having no perſonal Exiſtence. Now Biſhop *Pearſon* ſays, "When he (Chriſt) was "buffeted and ſcourged; there was no other Perſon ſenſible of "thoſe pains, than the eternal Word which before all Worlds was "impaſſible: p. 186. the fountain of the Deity, that Son of God "which made the World, he which was made Man, did ſuffer," p. 158. But all this is mere ſophiſtry, fallacy, and deluſion; for at the ſame time he tells us, the ſenſe of Pain fell only upon the human Nature; i.e. the Man; for he ſays; "the ſufferings of Chriſt "were not the ſufferings of his Deity, of which that was incapable; "but of his Humanity, unto which that was inclinable: for the divine "Eſſence ſuffered not." p. 187, 188. Thus he ſuppoſes the fountain of the Deity to ſuffer in ſuch a manner, as that the ſenſe of pain fell only upon the human Nature; which is not the fountain of the Deity, but a mere Man. Thus in Words he avoids the error of *Cerinthus*, by ſuppoſing the divine Being did not leave Jeſus at his Paſſion; but agrees with him in that he does λυειν τον Χριστον; divide Chriſt into two parts, the divine and human Nature; and ſuppoſes the ſufferings to be undergone by a mere Man.

Now this notion, that the human Soul only ſuffered, deſtroys the fundamental Principle of Chriſtianity: and there is no foundation for it in the Scripture. What we read there is, that the *Word* was made Fleſh, and dwelt among us[s]: That God prepared him a Body[t]: That he was conceived in the Womb of the Virgin *Mary*[u], and born of Her[x]. But that there was

[r] See the Quotation, p. 147, Hilary, &c. Note XXV. [s] John i. 14. [t] Heb. x. 5. [u] Luke i. 31. [x] Mat. i. 16.

any other Perſon or conſcious Being, who dwelt in that body, beſides the Word which came down from Heaven; is no where ſaid in the New Teſtament: and is founded merely upon a miſunderſtanding of the Hebrew Idiom in the Goſpels, where Chriſt is called a *Man*, and his *Soul* and *Spirit* are ſpoken of. From whence, the Chriſtians have imagined him to be compounded, not of two Natures only, but of three or four; for, according to the Determination of the Council of *Alexandria* againſt *Apollinaris*, Chriſt conſiſted of a Soul, and a Spirit, and a Body; beſides the divine Nature. But this is all a miſtaken Notion: For the Word *Man*, when uſed in the Scriptures, with regard to ſuperior Beings appearing in a human Form, never ſuppoſes them to be animated by a human Soul; but only by that ſuperior conſcious Being or Perſon. And in this Senſe the Word Man is uſed by *Juſtin Martyr*; when he ſays, that *Chriſt* was an Angel, and God, and Lord, and a *Man*, Ἀνήρ; and the *Man*, Ἄνθρωπος, that appeared to *Abraham* and *Iſaac*, and to *Moſes*. Ed. *Lond.* 262. And ſo *Daniel* calls the Angel *Gabriel*. ix. 21.

Thus it is ſaid, *Gen.* xxxii. 24. "And there wreſtled with him "(*Jacob*) a *Man*, until the breaking of the Day:" And this *Man* was an Angel in a human Form; as appears by Verſe the 30th. In like Manner, the three *Men* who appeared to *Abraham*, in the Plains of *Mamre*, were three Angels; and yet appeared as *Men*. And ſo the fourth *Man*, that was ſeen by *Nebuchadnezzar* in the fiery Furnace, is always underſtood to have been an Angel. Dan. iii. 25. So alſo, the Angel that appeared to *Joſhua* was as a *Man*: *Joſ.* v. 13. 15: And *Joſhua* addreſſed him as a real Man; and knew him for no other, till he diſcovered himſelf to him. So alſo, the Angel appeared as a *Man* to *Manoah*; who knew not that he was an Angel of the Lord, till he had aſcended in the Flame of the Altar. *Jud.* xiii. 11. 16. 21. And we find the ſame Language in the New Teſtament; where we are told, that at the Reſurrection of *Jeſus*, they ſaw a young *Man* ſitting at the right Side of the Sepulchre, clothed in a long white Garment; at which they were affrighted: and, at his Aſcenſion, two *Men*[z] ſtood by them, in white Apparel. All theſe Appearances were of Angels, in the Form of *Men*; yet none of theſe were ever ſuppoſed to be

[z] Mark xvi. 5. [a] Acts i. 10.

animated

animated by a human Soul; but only by their own *angelical* Perſons. Why then ſhould we underſtand St. *Paul* in another Senſe, when he tells us, "The ſecond *Man* was the Lord from Heaven[a]?" There is certainly no Difference once hinted-at in the Scriptures; nor can the leſt Reaſon be given, why a human Soul ſhould be introduced. Can it be thought neceſſary, that a Soul ſhould be created; merely that the Angels ſhould deliver a Meſſage, which they could as well deliver without it? The Body might afterwards be diſſolved into its conſtituent Parts; but a Soul is of a ſuperior Nature, and can never be ſuppoſed to be formed for ſuch an immediate Diſſolution or Annihilation.

This doctrine of *Apollinaris*, viz. That the Logos, or divine Perſon, which deſcended from Heaven, ſupplied the place of a Soul in *Chriſt*, is plain and intelligible; and anſwers much better than any other to the Texts which aſſert, that *Chriſt took on him the Seed of Abraham*; was made in the Likeneſs of Men; God was manifeſt in the Fleſh; came in the Fleſh; in the Likeneſs of ſinful Fleſh; in him dwelleth the Fullneſs of the Godhead; the Word was made Fleſh; was incarnate. "All theſe Texts of Scripture are, upon the "*Apollinarian* Scheme, natural, plain, and eaſy: It teaches a moſt "proper Unity of Perſon; as making the God Man *Jeſus Chriſt* to "be ſtrictly one intelligent Agent:[b]" It makes the very ſame Perſon ſuffer and die, that came down from Heaven; which is the fundamental Article of the Chriſtian Religion.

And Mr. *Whiſton* ſays; "The Scripture, and earlieſt Antiquity, "never affirm, that *Chriſt* took a human rational Soul; they "never ſay, he took a whole human nature; never ſay, he was in "that Senſe a true and perfect Man: But that he was made Fleſh; "had a Body prepared for him; was the Word, or a God incarnate; "was made in the Likeneſs of Men; was found in Faſhion as a "Man, while he was God the Word. Nay, *Ignatius* directly af-"firms; that it was the Word, and not a human Soul, which inha-"bited in that Body: And almoſt all the Antients agree in the "ſame Doctrine; even *Athanaſius* himſelf, before the Council of "*Nice*[c]."

And notwithſtanding the pains that were taken to diſcourage it,

[a] 1 Cor. xv. 47. [b] Sykes on the External Peace of the Church, 29, 30. [c] Whiſton's Account of the Convocation's proceding againſt him, 87.

it

it appeared again, in different ſhapes, in the Chriſtian Church, in the Doctrine of the *Monothelites*; who held, that *Chriſt* had only *one Will*; which, without doubt, is ſufficient for *one Perſon*. And in the Jewiſh church the ſame notion appeared among the cabaliſtic *Jews*, who looked upon the Angel *Metatron*, who they ſay inſtructed *Moſes*, to be the Soul of the *Meſſiah*: See *Allix*, 456. And this Angel they ſuppoſed to be the Angel of the Covenant, or the Angel of God, or the Viſible *Jehovah*; who appeared to the Patriarchs in a human form. Why then ſhould the Chriſtians imagine; that, when Chriſt is called a Man in their Scriptures, it has any other meaning; than when the Angel of the Covenant, or any other Angel, is called a Man in the writings of *Moſes*?

But as this opinion may perhaps be looked upon to be *new*; and ſo concluded to be *falſe*, without farther examination; I muſt be obliged to expatiate a little here, in order to prove its Antiquity: For there are many men, who hate Novelty as much as Falſity; or at leſt look upon the former, as a certain proof of the latter. Now this opinion is ſpoken-of ſo early as in the Epiſtle of *Ignatius* to the *Philadelphians*; in which, among other doctrines that he mentions as falſe, this is one; *viz.* that there was not in Chriſt a human ſoul, but the ſoul was ſupplied by the *Logos*[d]. From hence it would appear, if the Epiſtle was allowed to be genuine, that this notion was extremely antient; for *Ignatius* was Biſhop of *Alexandria* about the year 70. But the authority of it is doubted; and this very doctrine is given as a reaſon of that doubt. For we are told; that "in the Epiſtle to the *Philadelphians*, mention is made of this "Hereſy, that there was in Chriſt no human ſoul; yet was *Apol-* "*linaris Laodicenus* the firſt author thereof, who lived about the "year 370[e]." And beſides it is obſerved, that this Epiſtle is never quoted by any of the Ancients; nor was ever heard-of in the world, before *Odo Viennenſis*; who flouriſhed about the year 859. *Unit. Tracts.* If this be the caſe, it ſhews; that thoſe who foiſted it into this Epiſtle, wanted the authority of *Ignatius* to make it thought an error; but it does not appear, that it was ever looked upon in that light till condemned by the Council of *Alexandria*, near 300 years after, in 362; and *Apollinaris* by name, in 381.

But we are referred to *Apollinaris*; and told, that he is the Firſt who maintained this doctrine; and the Author of it. Probably, it

[d] Note XXVI. [e] Ἀρχαιοσυνία.

was

was never disputed before his time; because it was never before questioned, but was considered as the genuine doctrine of the Apostles; for it is held by all those, who are called *Jacobites*, and received their doctrines immediately from St. *James*; and, as others say, were converted by St. *Matthew*. These teach, with *Arius* and *Apollinaris*; that the *Word* hath a nature liable to change, and took Flesh without a Soul; and that the Body of the Lord hath not a Mind [*mentem*]; but the *Word* supplies its place; and these are extremely numerous in *Asia*. So that this doctrine is neither to be looked-upon as a private opinion of the *Arians*, nor of a late date; and all the Christian world was once of this persuasion. See the Letter of *Khalid*, the Mohammedan; *Sandii* Nuc. 101.

As long as the genius of the *Hebrew* language was well explaned by the converted *Jews*; the Christ, and the Soul and Spirit of Christ, were understood to signify the same thing as Christ himself; agreable to our own Scriptures, even when speaking of *Jehovah* himself. Thus we find in the Old Testament; Hast thou utterly rejected us? Hath thy *Soul* loathed *Sion*[f]? your new-moons, and your appointed feasts, my *Soul* hateth[g]. Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine Elect, in whom my *Soul* delighteth[h]. &c. And in the same sense the word Spirit is used: My *Spirit* shall not always strive with Men[i]. And St. *Paul* uses the same language: What man knoweth the things of a man, but the *Spirit* of man that is in him[k]; that is, the *Man himself*. Even so, the things of God knoweth no man, but the *Spirit* of God; that is, *God himself*[l]. So the Spirit of *Christ*, the Spirit of *Paul*, the Spirit of the *Medes*, signifies their Persons; and the Spirit of Burning, of Counsil, of Grace, &c. signifies the Things themselves. It is true, there are but few texts; in which we can be certain, whether the expression *the Spirit of God*, be mean'd of the Person of God the Father; or the Third Person of the Trinity, which is called the Holy Spirit: however, one or two are sufficient for my purpose; especially as the word Soul is so frequently used of God the Father, and is subject to no such equivoque. And it is very remarkable; that *Lucian*, who suffered Martyrdom at *Nicomedia*, and understood the *Hebrew* language so well that he translated the Scripture out of *Hebrew* into *Greek*; was of the same

[f] Jer. xiv. 19. [g] Isr i. 14. [h] Is. xlii. i. v. 9. [i] Gen. vi. 3. [k] 1 Cor. ii. 11. [l] Rom. viii. 9.

opinion, in this reſpect, with *Apollinaris*; in denying that Chriſt had any other ſoul than the *Logos*. *Epiph. in Ancor. Sand.* 210.

But when by the deciſions of the Councils, which made the Son of God equal to his own Father; the *Jews* were no longer capable of being converted to a Religion, which appeared to contradict the firſt Commandment of the Law; Chriſtianity loſt one of its chiefeſt ſupports, by loſing the knowledge of the *Hebrew* Language; which, during many ages, few of the learned [illegible] underſtood[m]: ſo that when they met with ſuch expreſſions as theſe which are uſed of Chriſt, My *Soul* is exceding ſorrowful[n]; Father, into thy hand I commend my *Spirit*[o]; they miſtook the ſenſe of the Idiom, and imagined that the Words *Soul and Spirit* were mean'd to expreſs ſomething different from Chriſt himſelf: not conſidering, that, by the ſame interpretation, they muſt ſuppoſe a Soul, and a Spirit, and a Divinity, in the Self-exiſtent *Jehovah*; who is abſolutely ſimple and uncompounded[p].

But the Council of *Alexandria* not obſerving the *Hebrew* idiom in theſe words, and having authority from the New Teſtament, to ſpeak not only of the Word of God, but alſo of his Soul and Spirit; declared, in oppoſition to *Apollinaris*, though they did not mention him by Name; that Chriſt had a Soul, and a Body, and a Spirit: and condemned his opinion as heretical. But whether *Apollinaris* had the truth on his ſide, or the Council that condemned him, ſtill continues a queſtion. Perhaps, if we conſider the Man, and his communication; and how little can be ſaid againſt him by thoſe, who were moſt willing to condemn him; we ſhall be apt to believe his opinion orthodox, in the *true* ſenſe of the word; and that the Council that condemned him were the Heretics. I refer you to the Note, for ſatisfaction in this particular: as it would make too long a digreſſion in the Text[q].

Now, ſince the words *Soul* and *Spirit*, when ſpoken of Chriſt, are only different phraſes to expreſs the ſame Perſon of Chriſt; and not the different Parts, of which he was compounded; the doctrine which conſiders Chriſt as two or three conſcious Beings united, ſometimes as God and ſometimes as Man, knowing a thing as God, and ignorant of it as a Man, cannot be proved from Scripture: and conſequently, the notion founded upon it, that the human nature of

[m] Note XXVII. [n] Mark xiv. 34. [o] Luke xxiii. 46. [p] Note XXVIII. [q] Note XVIII.

Chriſt

Christ suffered, but the Divine Nature was impassible, is without sufficient foundation to support it.

"*John* (says *Irenæus*) knew but one and the same person; who "was the Word of God, and the only Begotten, and was incarnate "for man's salvation; Jesus Christ, our Lord[a]."—And again, "Let "us not think, that Jesus is one person, and Christ another person; "but know, that they are both one and the same person."—And again, "*Paul* says, he knew nothing of that Christ, which departed "from Jesus; nor of that Saviour, who they say was impassible: "For, if it was one person that suffered, and another that re-"mained impassible; one person that was born, and another that "descended upon him that was born, and left him again (at his "Passion); then there is not *one*, but *two* persons[b]."—Again, "Jesus, "that suffered for us, is that very person who was the Word of "God.—The Word of God was made Flesh, and suffered.—If "Christ did not really suffer; no thanks are due to him, who "suffered nothing for us."—The Apostolic Constitutions say; "He "(God the Father) condescended that his Beloved, the Divine "Word, who was by nature impassible, should suffer for us: and "*Hippolytus* says, the impassible Word of God submitted to suf-"fer."

What I mean by these quotations from the Fathers, is only to shew; that the opinion I am defending is the old original Faith of the antient Writers: and that, in their days, the notion of two persons in Christ, or, which is the same thing, two natures, the one passible, the other impassible, was Heretical: which of them is the true opinion, is another question; and must be determined by Scripture.

And nothing is more manifest in the New Testament; than that it always considers the Christ that came down from Heaven, the Christ born of the Virgin, and the Christ that suffered, as the same individual person; and never speaks of Christ, as divided; or of one part of Christ, as acting distinct and separate from another: But declares; "Every spirit which divideth Jesus, is not of God." 1 *John*, iv. 3[c]. It never tells us, the Messiah who was called Christ, differed

[a] *Irenæus*, l. iii. c. 18. p. 242. *Jackson*, p. 42. [b] Ib. 242. [c] Ib. 42. [d] Many antient Copies read it so. *Irenæus*, lib. iii. c. 18. *Cerinthus* did λύειν Ἰησοῦν divide Christ into two persons. *Jackson*'s Reply to Dr. *Waterland*, p. 41.

from the Meſſiah that *Iſaiah* tells us was to ſuffer; or the Chriſt who came down from Heaven, differed from the Chriſt that died: but the Chriſt by whom God made the worlds, is repreſented as the very ſame perſon who purged our ſins, and whom God hath appointed Heir of all things; and it was the ſame Perſon that humbled himſelf, who became obedient to Death. But, if the Divine Nature did not ſuffer; where was the Humiliation? And when St. *Paul* proved, that "Jeſus "was the Chriſt;" he proved, that they were one and the ſame perſon; for there can be no other meaning to the words, "Jeſus "knew that *he* (i. e. himſelf, the very ſame perſon, ſubſtance, and "nature) came from God, and went to God:" I came from the Father, ſays he; and am come into the world: Again, I, the very ſame perſon that came from the Father, leave the world, and go to the Father[g]: It was the Son of Man that aſcended up where he was before[h]: He that deſcended, was the ſame (perſon) alſo that aſcended up far above all Heavens, that he might fill all things[i]: The ſame Word, that was in the beginning with God, and made all Things, was made Fleſh[k]: The Child that was born of the Virgin, was *Emanuel*; or *God with us*[l].

We are told by St. *Paul*, that Chriſt gave *himſelf* for us[m]; that he gave *himſelf* for the Church[n]; that he gave *himſelf* a ranſom for all[o]; who being the brightneſs of his (the Father's) glory, and the expreſs image of his Perſon, when he had, by *himſelf*, purged our ſins, ſat down at the right hand of the Majeſty on High[p]: It was *himſelf* that took Fleſh[q]; and *himſelf* that ſuffered[r]. From all theſe Texts, nothing is more plane than this; that it was Chriſt *himſelf* that was given for us, and ſuffered, and died; and not a *Part of himſelf* only. If ſuch an unaccountable Senſe, as that of a *Half Self*, had been the true meaning of the Texts; it would certainly have been ſo explained: ſuch a Senſe having never been heard of before; nor intelligible, ever ſince it was firſt invented: For was the Divine Nature Chriſt *himſelf*, or was the Human nature Chriſt *himſelf*? or had he a double Self; one of which ſuffered, and the other did not? or will the *Pſeudo Athanaſians* tell us, that two Selves are joined in one Perſon; as they ſay two Natures are? God has reveled to us a plane and intelligible doctrine;

[f] Acts xviii. 28. [g] John xiii. 3. [h] John xvi. 28. [i] John vi. 62. [k] Eph. iv. 10.
[l] John i. ii. & xiv. [m] John xiii. 3. [n] Eph. v. 2. [o] Ib. 25. [p] 1. Tim. ii. 6, 14.
[q] Heb. i. 3. [r] Heb. ii. 14. [s] Ib. xviii. 9. 26.

that

that the Divine Being, by whom he created us, came down from Heaven, and underwent Sufferings and Death for our Salvation: and the Chriſtians have made it abſolutely unintelligible, by their Refinements. For whereas there is not the leſt intimation through the whole Scripture, that by the words Meſſiah, the Chriſt, the Son of Man, Jeſus Chriſt, the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Son of God, the Saviour, Himſelf, &c. is ever meant only a Part of the Meſſiah, a Part of Chriſt, a Part of the Son of Man, a Part of Himſelf, &c. and ſometimes one part, and ſometimes another; ſo that ſometimes one thing is ſaid of him, and ſometimes the direct contrary: Can any thing be a greater proof than this, that ſome Chriſtians have miſtaken the nature of that Being? or, Can there be a better proof, that others have a right opinion of him; than by underſtanding the nature of his perſon in ſuch a manner, as to render all the expreſſions in the Scripture which relate to him, plain and intelligible; in the ſame ſenſe always, and in the natural and literal meaning; *viz.* That the ſame perſon, who was born into the world, in the days of *Herod*, and ſuffered and died; was alſo before *Abraham*, and *Abraham* ſaw his day; and that the ſame perſon, who preached by the Spirit, in the days of *Noah*; preached alſo to Mankind, in the reign of *Tiberius Cæſar*. To make them two diſtinct perſons, is to contradict the Scripture; which declares them to be One and the ſame Perſon: and to ſuppoſe the One Perſon which ſuffered to be at the ſame time impaſſible, is to contradict the common ſenſe and reaſon of Mankind; ſo far as to make the Revelation unintelligible and uſeleſs.

Again, the Scripture mentions it as the higheſt inſtance of the love of God to Man; that he ſpared not his own Son, but freely gave him up for us all. But how inconſiſtent is this with the notion, that this ſupremacy of love conſiſted in the death of a mere Man; which thoſe Chriſtians are obliged to maintain, who believe Chriſt to be the Supreme God? Thoſe very Chriſtians, I ſay, who pretend to have the higheſt ſentiments of Chriſt, and therefore exalt him to an equality with the Father; when they come to conſider his Death, that grand event, in which the infinite love of God was manifeſted to Mankind; find it impoſſible for them to maintain, that the Supreme God ſuffered and died: and are therefore forced to explane this infinity of love to conſiſt in the death and ſufferings of a mere Man; thereby reducing him too *low*, as they had before exalted him too *high*, to be conſiſtent with Scripture: For the Scripture declares the Sufferer to

be the Chriſt; and the Chriſt to be the very Perſon, i. e. the ſame intelligent Subſtance, that came down from Heaven; and came not of himſelf, but the Father ſent him. And *Iſaiah* tells us, it was the ſame Perſon whom God would ſend, and would pleaſe to bruiſe and put to grief, that made his Soul an offering for ſin, and poured out his Soul unto Death, and was rewarded, and divided the ſpoil with the ſtrong[s]. So that there is no more room, from the Scriptures, for any ſuch imagination as that of two intelligent Natures in Chriſt; the one human, the other divine; the one paſſible, the other impaſſible; than to believe, there were two Meſſiahs; the one of them to ſuffer, and the other to be triumphant; the one the Son of David, and the other the Son of *Joſeph* of *Ephraim*[t]: for Chriſt is always ſpoken of, both in the Old and New Teſtament, as one and the ſame Perſon.

But in direct oppoſition to this fundamental Article of Chriſtianity; that the Son of God, who came down from Heaven, was the ſame Perſon who ſuffered death upon the Croſs; Biſhop *Pearſon* ſays, in ſupport of his own Hypotheſis, as follows; "We muſt not "think ſo low of the Eſſence of the Word; as to think it ſubject to "the ſufferings of the Fleſh[u]:" And again, "the ſufferings of Chriſt "were not the ſufferings of his Deity, of which that was incapable; "but of his Humanity, as unto which that was inclin'able: for the "Divine Eſſence ſuffered not[w]." Thus the antient Chriſtians argued upon Chriſt's weeping over *Jeruſalem*, [*quaſi fletus Chriſto non conveniret*,] that it was not agreable to his Character; upon which, they ſtruck it out of their Copies[x]. But his Lordſhip muſt diſtinguiſh very nicely; if he ſuppoſes it below the dignity of the Divine Nature of Chriſt, to *die*; and yet not below it, to be *born* of a Woman; and *live* in this World, ſubjected to the indignities which he received: for in truth no humiliation could be improper to be undertaken by any originate Being; which God ſhould think proper to appoint him. By this method of reaſoning, the Biſhop falls into the very error which he combats with ſo much zele; even the Hereſy of *Socinus*, *Paul* of *Samoſata*, and *Artemas*: for, if nothing ſuffered but the human nature, no other perſon ſuffered but a mortal Man.

By this we ſee; that the ſufferings of that Perſon who came down from Heaven, which was to the *Jews* a ſtumbling-block, and to the *Greeks* fooliſhneſs; is ſtill conſidered by the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians* in the

[s] Iſ. iv. 3. [t] Let. iv. p. 49. [u] Page 187. [w] Ib. 188. [x] N. 151.

ſame

ſame light; for which reaſon, though they allow it in *words*, yet they deny it in *fact*. But after all the ſophiſtry uſed to diſguiſe the Truth, it is infallibly certain; that, when God is ſaid to ſuffer in the nature of Man, yet if God himſelf does not feel the pain, but Man only, it is the Man alone that ſuffers.

And yet, what is ſtill more amazing; though his Lordſhip declares, that nothing ſuffered but the Human Nature, or a mere Man; he lays the whole merit of Chriſt's ſufferings upon their being the ſufferings of God. I ſhall quote the Biſhop's words, as being a perſon every way reſpectable; to ſhew the modern opinion on this point.

"We know," ſays the Biſhop, "that it is impoſſible for the "blood of bulls and goats to take away ſins; and we may well "doubt, how the blood of him, that hath no other nature than "that of Man, can take away the ſins of other Men; there ap-"pearing no ſuch difference, as will ſhew a Certainty of the one, "and an Impoſſibility of the other: But ſince we may be bought "with a Price, well may we believe the Blood of Chriſt ſuffi-"ciently precious; when we are aſſured, that it is the Blood of "God."

This Argument is founded upon a notion, no leſs derogatory from the honour of God, than full of confuſion in itſelf; *viz.* That God could not forgive the ſins of Men, without an adequate and equivalent Satisfaction paid to his Juſtice; and this could only be done by the Sufferings and Death of Chriſt, who is the Supreme God: no other Satisfaction being equivalent to the Debt. And therefore he *himſelf* ſuffered and died; and thereby ſatisfied his juſtice and wrath againſt the ſins of Men; and forgave them freely, upon receiving full ſatisfaction and payment. Or thus, in other words: The Second Perſon of the Trinity ſuffered, in order to ſatisfy the wrath of the Firſt Perſon in the Trinity, for the ſins of Men; which Firſt Perſon, who required the ſatisfaction, is the ſame God as the Second Perſon, who paid it. The true Scripture Doctrine upon this Subject ſhall be hereafter explained; agreably to Reaſon, and the common Principles of mankind: I ſhall only conſider, at preſent; whether the Blood ſpill'd was the Blood of the Supreme God, as his Lordſhip ſuppoſes.

[a] *Bearſon*, p. 142.

Now

Now, according to this Notion and Argument, if the Blood of Christ be not the Blood of God, not only in *word*, but in *fact*; it follows, that we may doubt how *his* Blood could take away Sins; when the Blood of bulls and goats could not. And yet the Bishop allows, that the Supreme God is not capable of Sufferings and Death; and says, that the Divine Nature of Christ suffered as little, as if it had not been conjoined to the Human Nature. From all which, it inevitably follows; that, if Christ be the Supreme God, then either the Supreme God is capable of Sufferings, and did suffer; or else, that the Blood of Christ did not take away Sin: a very rash and false Dilemma.

And now, says the Bishop, the only difficulty will consist in this: "How we can say, that God did suffer; when we profess the "Godhead suffered not:" *or*, as he expresses it in another place, "the Divine Nature suffered not; but the Human Nature only[b]." And this, he says, will meet with an easy Solution; if we consider the intimate conjunction of the divine and human Nature, and their union in the Person of the Son; for hereby those Attributes, which properly belong to the one, are given to the other.

But this is not *true*; and does not answer the difficulty. For, in the first place, Nature is a mere abstract idea, and incapable of suffering; whether it be divine or human: nothing can suffer, but a Person; that is, a living intelligent substance, or agent; a property, or number of properties, (in which the nature of every Being consists,) is incapable of it; and consequently, if it be said, two Natures are united in one Person, neither of these Natures can suffer; but only the Person, or intelligent conscious Being, to whom it belongs. If the Person does not suffer, there can be no suffering undergone; for to suppose suffering, and no Person to suffer, is a contradiction. Bishop *Fowler* says; I do believe the Redemption of Mankind to be the Redemption of the particular Men of all Mankind: nor can I understand, what the Redemption of human Nature can signify; in any other sense: I could never tell, where Universal Nature exists; but in the finest head-pieces of Metaphysicians. *Reflect. on the Exam. of his Discourse on the Man Jesus Christ.* Therefore, if Christ be the Supreme God; the Person of the Supreme God did suffer, or it did not. If it be allowed, that he did not suffer; the question is given-up:

[a] *Pearson*, p. 189. [b] Ib. 192.

and

and no other Being ſuffered, but a mortal Man; which the Biſhop calls the human Nature, and *Cerinthus* calls the Man *Jeſus*: and this is *Socinianiſm*. And if it be ſaid, the Supreme God did ſuffer; this is the doctrine of the *Patripaſſians* and *Sabellians*, and contrary to the principle, that the Supreme God is impaſſible: and to ſolve this contradiction, is no ſuch eaſy matter.

If it be urged, as ſome have ſuppoſed, that not only the divine and human Natures, but the Two Perſons alſo, the Logos, and the human Soul, were united in one Perſon: Let us conſider, how cloſe this union was; and the conſequence of it.

It is remarkable, that the *Athanaſian* Creed ſays; "There is "one Perſon [ὑπόστασις] of the Father, and another of the Son."—And the ſame Creed ſays; that "God and Man are One altogether—by unity of Perſon," [ὑποστάσεως] Here then we find; that, (if *Hypoſtaſis* means Perſon, as the Orthodox underſtand it, and the *Engliſh* tranſlate it;) God and Man are more ſtrictly united, than the Father and the Son: for the Father and Son are different Perſons; but God and Man are united in Perſon: i. e. they are One and the ſame Perſon: And if they continued perfectly united; ſo that God and Man were One Perſon *at* his Paſſion, as well as *before* it; then, the conſequence muſt be; that, if Man ſuffered, God alſo ſuffered: for it will be a contradiction to ſay, that the human Perſon, or Soul of Man, ſuffered; and the Divine Perſon, or Logos, which was ſo united to it as to be the ſame Perſon, did not ſuffer; or that one knew the end of the World, and the other did not: becauſe Unity of Perſon admits of no ſuch diſtinction, as the *one* and the *other*. And in this ſenſe, the Biſhop's aſſertion muſt amount to this manifeſt abſurdity; that the ſame One Perſon who ſuffered, did not ſuffer; and the ſame One Perſon who did know the end of the World, did not know it. And this his Lordſhip allows to be Fact; how unintelligible ſoever it may appear: For he ſuppoſes, that the name Chriſt ſignifies a paſſible and impaſſible Subſtance, in one Perſon; [ἀπαθοῦς καὶ παθητῆς οὐσίας ἐν μοναδικῷ προσώπῳ προσηγορίαν σημαντικήν] a ſingle Perſon, in a double Nature; impaſſible as God, and paſſible as Man. *Ariv.* iii. p. 163, 164.—Now, if it be not a Contradiction to aſſert, that Paſſibility and Impaſſibility can exiſt in the ſame Perſon, at the ſame time; we may aſſert or deny what we pleaſe. In like manner, with regard to Chriſt's not knowing the Day of Judgement; it is to no purpoſe to ſay, that Chriſt conſiſted of two Natures

in one Perſon; according to one of which he knew it, and according to the other he did not: for, if he knew it in either nature; it cannot be ſaid of the Perſon of Chriſt, or the Son of Man, that he was ignorant of it. This will appear by a plane inſtance: A Man conſiſts of a Body, and a Spirit; and a Spirit has not fleſh and bones: Can it therefore be aſſerted, that the Compound Man has not fleſh and bones? By no means. It may be aſſerted, that Man has what either Nature has; but it cannot be denied, that he has what belongs to either. He may be ſaid to think, becauſe his Soul thinks; but it cannot be denied that he thinks, becauſe the Body does not. It cannot therefore be ſaid, that Chriſt knew not; becauſe the human Soul knew not: If he was perſonally ignorant, he was totally ſo in both Natures; and conſequently could not, in either of his Natures, be the Supreme God.

But if the literal Unity of Perſon be not admitted; and we ſuppoſe, with the Biſhop, that God and Man were not ſo ſtrictly united, as to become one ſingle identical Perſon; but only joined together: Then, what muſt become of the Prophecies? For let the conjunction be ever ſo intimate; yet, if the Prophecies relating to one Perſon, are not fulfilled in that ſame Perſon; but in another, that is joined to him; it will juſtly be argued, that they have never been fulfilled, in the ſenſe in which they were given; and, indeed, never properly fulfilled at all. If the Meſſiah be one Perſon, who was ſent down from Heaven to ſuffer, and never did ſuffer; and the Chriſt who ſuffered, was another Perſon, who himſelf never exiſted till he was born of the Virgin *Mary*; the Prophecy of *Iſaiah* has never been completed.

But there is no danger of this fatal conſequence; for, if we follow the Biſhop a little farther, we ſhall find; that there was no ſuch conjunction of Natures ever made. He argues, that there was no Union of Natures; becauſe there could be no converſion, or tranſubſtantiation, of one into the other; nor commixtion, or confuſion, of both into one: and that the two Natures kept their reſpective properties diſtinct[a]. Now it follows, if the Subſtances were diſtinct; that is, if the Subſtance of the Soul, and the Divine Subſtance, were unmixed; and their Properties were diſtinct; that the Perſons muſt alſo be diſtinct; for there can be no meaning to the word Perſon,

[a] *Pearſon*, p. 161. 188.

that

that is not comprehended in the words *Subſtance* and *Properties*. And therefore *Novatian*, in order to be conſiſtent with himſelf, made no ſcruple to allow; that the Word and the Fleſh were commixed: affirming, that Chriſt was not only *Man*, but *God*, according to the Scriptures; *Divinitate Sermonis in ipſâ concretione permixtâ*[a]: And *Origen* ſays, the Humanity of Chriſt was exalted to ſuch a degree of Divinity; not only by Communication of the Word, but alſo by its Union and Commixtion; by which it became a *God*[b]. But his Lordſhip ſuppoſes a Union of Perſons, without any ſuch Commixtion; which is impoſſible. For if we mean *any thing* by this Union of Perſons or intelligent Beings, it cannot poſſibly be leſs than this; that they ſhall be ſuſceptible of, and obnoxious to, the ſame Senſations and Reflexions; the ſame Pleaſure or Pain, the ſame Knowledge or Ignorance. But the Biſhop tells us, No: "The two Natures kept their Properties diſtinct[c]." Now, if that were the caſe; ſo that the one ſhould ſuffer Pain, while the other did not; the one ſhould know, while the other was ignorant; 'tis plane, the Conjunction or Union of Perſons muſt be only imaginary or nominal: For, as neither the divine nor human *Nature* can either feel or know, but the divine and human *Perſons* only; to aſſert ſuch an Union, is to aſſert, that the ſame Perſon did ſuffer, and did not ſuffer; did know, and did not know; at the ſame time: which is as plane a conceſſion as can be made, that the Perſons were not one and the ſame; but different and diſtinct: for knowing, and not knowing; feeling, and not feeling; are the ſtrongeſt proofs of a diſtinct Conſciouſneſs, that can be given; and a diſtinct Conſciouſneſs is the ſtrongeſt proof of a diſtinct Perſonality; and, conſequently, there could be no ſuch Union; as his Lordſhip contends for: Or, if it muſt be called a Conjunction and Union of Perſons, to ſerve a Hypotheſis; it is of ſuch a nature, as to leave no difference between a Conjunction and a Separation. But, how intimate ſoever the Conjunction is ſuppoſed to be; yet, as long as the Perſons can be ſo far diſtinguiſhed the one from the other, that one may ſuffer, and the other be incapable of ſuffering; (which is a ſufficient diſtinction to infer a Difference, and conſequently a plurality of Perſons:) the queſtion will be, Which of them ſuffered; and which did not? And if the divine Perſon did not ſuffer, becauſe he is the Supreme God, and incapable of ſuffering; then it could be only a mortal Man that ſuffered. So that, whether they be joined, or ſeparate, or

[a] *Novat.* de Trin. cap. ii. 89. [b] Contra *Cels.* Le *Plat.* Div. 31. [c] *Pearſon*, p. 163.

the ſame; if the divine Nature, or the Godhead, that is, in plain Words, *God* himſelf, the infinite, ſelf-exiſtent, intelligent Subſtance, did not ſuffer; but merely the human Nature, or the Humanity, that is, *Man*; it was not the Blood of *God*, but the Blood of *Man*: And ſo the Biſhop's argument ends in the Doctrine of *Socinus*.

If it be ſaid, that Chriſt is both God and Man, "*God*, of the "Subſtance of the *Father*; *begotten, before all Worlds*; and *Man*, "of the Subſtance of his *Mother*; *born, in the World*[a];" the ſame queſtion will return: Was it *God*, begotten of the Subſtance of the *Father*, that ſuffered; or *Man*, born of the Subſtance of the *Mother*? To ſay, it was *God*, of the Subſtance of the *Father*, that ſuffered, is the Doctrine of *Sabellius* and the *Patripaſſians*: to ſay, it was only *Man*, of the Subſtance of the *Mother*; is the Hereſy of *Socinus*: and to ſay, that *Chriſt* did not continue conjoined to *Jeſus*, or the divine to the human Perſon, at his Paſſion; is the Hereſy of *Cerinthus*. And beſides, upon that Suppoſition, the Conjunction was diſſolved; and conſequently no Blood of *God* was [illegible].

Laſtly, if the *divine* Subſtance of Chriſt be impaſſible; and it was *Man* alone, who ſuffered; how can our Sins be ſaid to be taken away by the Blood of *God*, *Acts* xx. 28; who did not, and could not ſuffer? or by the Blood of *Chriſt*, *Eph.* i. 7; if He be the Supreme God, as well as Man? It is manifeſt, the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians* cannot explane theſe Texts; which, upon the *Apollinarian* Scheme, are plane and eaſy. They are every way ſurrounded with Hereſies; and, by flying from any one of them, unavoidably fall into an oppoſite one.

If it be alleged, as the Biſhop ſpeaks; that, by this intimate Conjunction or Union, whatever is true of the Human Nature, may be ſaid of the Divine Nature; and, *vice verſa*, whatever is true of the Divine Nature, may be ſaid of the Human Nature; by a commutation of Properties: and ſo *God* may be ſaid to ſuffer; becauſe *Man*, which He calls the Human Nature, ſuffered[c]; I anſwer; that, by the ſame argument, every propoſition in the New Teſtament, which relates to the Birth, Life, and Death of Chriſt, may be denied; and it may be proved, that Man did not ſuffer; becauſe the Divine Nature did not ſuffer: and the Impaſſibility of *God* may be aſſerted of *Man*. And an argument, which proves each Side of a

[a] *Athanaſ.* Creed. [c] *Preface*, 188.

Contra-

Contradiction equally; and aſſerts that we may ſay, what we know to be falſe and impious; muſt be mere Sophiſtry.

It may be farther obſerved; though the Biſhop ſays, "By the "intimate Conjunction of the Divine and Human Nature, thoſe "Attributes, which *properly belong* to the one, *are given* to the "other—and therefore we may truely *ſay*, God is Man; *&c.*— "and what belongs to the Human Nature, *may be ſpoken of God*; "and the properties of the Human Nature, *may be attributed to* "*the Son of God*; &c." yet in the next paragraph, where he explanes himſelf farther, he allows; that the *eſſential* properties of one Nature, are not *really* communicated to the other Nature: *&c.*

And therefore, the moſt that can be made of this Commutation of Properties, as the Biſhop calls it, is not any thing *real*; but only *verbal*: It is not a Commutation of *Properties*; for they are not changed: but only a Commutation of *Words*; or an allowed Impropriety of Speech. And the Blood of *Man* is *called* the Blood of *God*, though it be not ſo in *reality*; by the ſame liberty of ſpeech, as when we ſay; that a *Man* is buried in the Grave: And the whole that the Biſhop has advanced upon this argument, amounts to no more than this; that the liberty of ſpeech allows us to ſay, that *God* ſuffered and died; becauſe a *Man* ſuffered and died, to whom God was once conjoined: but it will by no means prove; that his Sufferings were the Sufferings of that *God* who was ſo conjoined, and who is declared to be incapable of ſuffering; but merely the Sufferings of a *Man*, whom he calls by the name of *God*. And thus the argument, however ſpecious it may appear in words, is in fact a *Socinian* Doctrine; that nothing ſuffered, but a mere *Man*; whom, for certain reaſons, he calls by the name of *God*. Whereas the *Apollinarian* Doctrine, which is the Doctrine of the New Teſtament, declares the Sufferings to have been undergone by the Divine Perſon *himſelf*; who came down from Heaven to be born of the Virgin *Mary*.

To ſhew the Fallacy of his Lordſhip's argument in another Light, let us conſider a parallel Caſe; and examine the ſame way of reaſoning with regard to Man, conſiſting of Soul and Body. It muſt be allowed, that in common ſpeech we ſay; ſuch a *Man* is gone to Heaven; or ſuch a *Man* lies in the Grave. Here by the word *Man*, we ſometimes mean the *Body*, and ſometimes the

Soul; and uſe the word *Man* indiſcriminately, for either or both[1]. But does it follow; becauſe I am allowed to ſpeak in this improper and indeterminate manner, when I only mean to diſtinguiſh *one Man from another*; that I can uſe the ſame word indiſcriminately, when I want to aſcertain the different *Parts* of which the ſame Man conſiſted; or to inform another Perſon, perhaps an ignorant *Indian*, which it is that is gone to Heaven; the *Body*, or the *Soul*; and which it is that remains in the Grave? Can I then ſay, in the words of *Æneas*, *Animamque ſepulchro condimus*. *Æn.* iii. 67? No: I muſt then anſwer, more preciſely and determinately; that the *Soul* is gone to *Heaven*, and the *Body* lies in the *Grave*; and not ſuppoſe a Commutation of Properties, and ſay; the *Body* is gone to *Heaven*, and the *Soul* lies in the *Grave*. And if I could ſay ſo, without an Impropriety; (that is, if ſuch a way of ſpeaking were allowable;), yet it would be no proof that the *Body* was actually gone to *Heaven*, and the *Soul* was in the *Grave*; but only an inſtance of the great liberty of ſpeech which was taken and allowed; of uſing the words *Soul* and *Body* ſo indiſcriminately and unphiloſophically.

But if a Man may aſſert, that the *Supreme God* ſuffered; when he declares him, at the ſame time, to be incapable of ſuffering; and this, only becauſe the *Man* who ſuffers may be called improperly by the name of *God*; and argue, that the merit of the Blood which this *Man* ſhed, conſiſted in its being the Blood of the *Supreme God*; this puts an end to all farther argument upon the ſubject; ſince both Sides of a Contradiction are here planely aſſerted; *viz.* that the *Supreme God* did ſuffer; and at the ſame time did not ſuffer, but was incapable of ſuffering; and that the Blood of *Man* was the Blood of *God*; though it is allowed, at the ſame time, that it was not *really* the Blood of *God*, but only *called* ſo; being in *reality* the Blood of *Man*. And it appears to me impoſſible to get clear of this Contradiction, as long as Chriſt is believed to be the Subſtance of the Self-exiſtent God, which is impaſſible; and yet to have ſuffered on the Croſs. For the two Propoſitions are abſolutely inconſiſtent; and, if he did not feel pain, he did not ſuffer.

And it by no means ſolves or leſſens the Difficulty; to ſay, as the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians* do; that the *Divine Perſon* ſuffered in the

[1] Note XXX.

Human Nature only: for the queſtion here is, not in what Nature he ſuffered; but, whether he ſuffered at all. A Being that is impoſſible can no more ſuffer in one Nature, than in another. The plain queſtion is this only, Whether the Supreme God felt pain?

As the Biſhop's Opinion on this ſubject appears to me, for theſe reaſons, to deſtroy the fundamental Article of the *Chriſtian* Religion; i. e. the Death and Sufferings of the identical Meſſiah who came down from Heaven: So Dr. *Waterland*'s Opinion ſeems alſo to deſtroy the firſt and fundamental Article of *Natural* Religion; viz. the Belief of One ſelf-exiſtent and unoriginate Supreme God, and Governer of the Univerſe. He tells us; "He has nothing to ſay, why the "Son might not have been Father; but that *in fact* he is not: and "that there was no Impoſſibility, in the nature of the thing, but "that the Father himſelf might have acted the Miniſterial Part[s]."

Now, as the Doctor ſees no Impoſſibility, but that the Son might be the Father; it is plane to me, that in *his* notion or idea of the Supreme God and Father of the Univerſe, he leaves out the Attribute of abſolutely neceſſary Self-exiſtence: For if he did not do ſo, it muſt have appeared to him as clear as the light; that an originated Being, a Being who was begotten, could not poſſibly be ſelf-exiſtent, or neceſſarily exiſtent; in an abſolute Senſe: For to ſuppoſe, that neceſſary exiſtence is *poſſible to have been*, where in truth and nature it *is not*; is to ſuppoſe it not to be *neceſſary* exiſtence; but *precarious* exiſtence. If it had been poſſible for the Son to have been neceſſarily exiſtent, i. e. ſelf-exiſtent, he would have been ſo; and could not poſſibly have been otherwiſe: And if it had been poſſible for the Father not to have been *neceſſarily* exiſtent; he could not poſſibly have been neceſſarily exiſtent, or ſelf-exiſtent[h].

'Tis true, that Dr. *Waterland* ſays; "the Father is *God*, in the "ſtrict ſenſe of neceſſary exiſting, *as oppoſed to precarious exiſtence*; "and the Son *God*, and the Holy Ghoſt *God*; in the ſame ſenſe "of the word *God*." But this is not ſufficient to prove them all Three to be the *Supreme* God; becauſe the Father is God, in a higher ſenſe of the word *God*, than is here uſed: For when Dr. *Waterland* ſpeaks of the neceſſary exiſtence of the Son and Holy Ghoſt, *as*

[s] *Philal. Cant.* 46. and 2d Pt. 12, 13. *Waterland's* Second Defence, 177. [h] Ib. p. 13.

oppoſed

oppoſed to precarious exiſtence; he does not mean, that they are ſelf-exiſtent, and unoriginate, as the Father is; but only that they are neceſſarily generated, or derived, or emanant, from the Father's Subſtance; and, in this ſenſe of neceſſary exiſtence, if there be one there may be one thouſand, or ten thouſand, neceſſarily exiſtent. Whereas, neceſſary exiſtence, conſidered in the higheſt, i. e. an abſolute ſenſe, as it belongs to God the Father, means unoriginate, independent, underived, Self-exiſtence: which is an Attribute of the Firſt Cauſe only; and is incapable of being communicated by Generation, Derivation, or any way whatever. And therefore, in the Senſe in which Dr. *Waterland* ſuppoſes the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, to be all neceſſarily exiſtent; *in the ſtrict ſenſe of neceſſary exiſtence, as oppoſed to precarious exiſtence*; and to be God, in the *ſame* ſenſe of the Word: he leaves-out the idea of abſolute, unoriginate Self-exiſtence; and therefore does not conſider the word *God* in the *higheſt* ſenſe of the Word, in which ſenſe it can be applied to no other Being but the *Supreme God*; i. e. the Father only: *viz.* that he is un-originate, and ſelf-exiſtent.

And this is the fundamental Error of Dr *Waterland*; which runs through his whole Book. All his Miſtakes ariſe from ſetting-out wrong at firſt; for when once he had formed his idea of a *Supreme God*, without including *Self-exiſtence* in it; he could eaſily ſuppoſe, that the Attributes of the *Supreme God* were communicable to the *Son*, and were actually communicated to him; and thereby the *Son* became equal in his Perfections to the *Father* himſelf, from whom he received them: and ſo the Perfections being the ſame in each, and the Subſtance alſo ſuppoſed the ſame; the *Father* might be the *Son*, and the *Son* the *Father*; for any thing this learned Chriſtian ſaw to the contrary: And he might, by the ſame way of reaſoning, as eaſily have ſuppoſed a thouſand Supreme Beings equal with the Father, as only one or two; for it is no Contradiction at all to imagine, that all communicable Attributes may be actually communicated by the Supreme God, to as many Perſons as he pleaſes. And this was the more eaſy for him to believe; becauſe he confined the meaning of the word *God* to the *Subſtance* of God only; and conſequently could believe every Being to be God, that partook of that *Subſtance*: and, as he knew nothing at all about the Subſtance of God, he might as eaſily believe a thouſand different Perſons to partake of it, and ſo become

come Gods; as one only. Nay, according to his notion, the number *muſt* be infinite: For, if the Son did receive from God the Father, *by a neceſſity of Nature*, equal Perfection and Plenitude in every reſpect; (which is Dr. *Waterland's* opinion:) then the Second and Third Perſons, having the ſame Perfection and Plenitude of Nature, muſt unavoidably produce as many more; and ſo on, *ad infinitum*.

The Doctor therefore, who could ſee no difficulty at firſt, in ſuppoſing a Supreme God, without his eſſential and peculiar Attribute of Self-exiſtence; could eaſily ſuppoſe all that followed, as the natural conſequences of his firſt poſition. And the only difficulty he ſeemed ſenſible of, was this; how the *communicable* Attributes ſhould be actually *communicated* to two other Perſons, who had them not by Nature; and yet thoſe other Perſons, to whom they were communicated, ſhould be the ſame *God* that communicated them. If he communicated them to his own Perſon, this was no proper Communication; for he had them before: and if he communicated them to two other Perſons, then there muſt be three equally Supreme Perſons that govern the Univerſe; or three equally Supreme Gods: And how this could be conſiſtent with the Scripture Doctrine; which declares that *God* is *One*, *Jehovah* is *One*; was a great difficulty. But this is anſwered by him in as extraordinary a manner, as ſuch an unaccountable Syſtem muſt be ſuppoſed to require; viz. "That no certain principle of Individuation ever *has been*, or *can be* fixed." That is, when taken out of ſcholaſtic terms; that we never *did*, and never *can* know, what we mean by One; or how to diſtinguiſh One from more than One. This is juſt like the argument brought by *Cyril* and others, in defenſe of a Trinity of Three ſeparate Beings; in which they aſſert Three Men to be only One Man. But if we do not know the difference between One and Three, it is time to have done with all diſputes whatever; for we muſt be utterly uncapable to judge of Truth and Falſehood. Thus the *Unity* of God is left to follow his *neceſſary exiſtence*; and theſe two principal fences being betrayed to the enemy; the Syſtem of Natural Religion is laid open to Polytheiſm, on the one ſide; and Atheiſm, on the other. For, if we have no principle of Individuation; many Gods may, for aught we know, be the One God we are commanded to worſhip; as Dr. *Cudworth* has obſerved: or, if there be only Three of theſe; and theſe are all ſuppoſed

[1] Note XVI.

to

to be *equal*; there can be no One of these above the other Two; and consequently no *Supreme God* at all; but the τὸ πᾶν. Or thus: if no reason can be given, why an unoriginate Being might not be originate; there can be no proof of the existence of any self-existent and unoriginate Being at all: For, if there be not some ground or reason of existence, in the very Nature of the First Cause, why he exists rather than not; which ground or reason of existence is not in any other Being in the Universe: then he may, for any thing we can prove to the contrary, cease to exist; without any ground or reason for it: For if he could exist, without any ground or reason why he existed; he may, without any ground or reason, cease to exist. Whereas all other Beings, whose existence was effected by a Cause which produced the Effect; can only cease to exist by a Cause which shall produce the contrary Effect: and consequently, they are less precarious in their Existence than God himself; which is absurd and blasphemous.

Lastly, to shew how far these principles will carry a Man contrary to all *Revelation*, as well as *Natural Religion*; it is from hence that Dr. *Waterland* concludes; that the first Generation of the Son (which he allows to be the most proper Filiation) is a mere Co-existence with the Father; and not any Derivation from him. And Mr. *Cumming* argues to the same purpose: "For having taken notice, that the Fathers not "only use the terms, *Principle*, *Fountain*, *Root*; but plainly assert, "that the Father was the original *Author* and *Cause*, of the Son; "and superior to him, in respect of *Causality*; and that by such ex-"pressions they gave advantage to the *Arians*: he declares his "Opinion; that such Words ought to be exploded out of the Chris-"tian Theology: as having no foundation either in Reason or Re-"velation. For (saith he) if the Son of God be God himself, "and of the same Essence with the Father; to which Essence it "belongs to be uncaused, or to exist necessarily; He (the Son) can "have no Cause or Author; but is as much without Original, or "beginning of Being, as the Father himself. On the other hand; "whatever hath a proper Cause or Original of Being, must have "Limits of Being; and that can never enter into our notion "of God."[k]

Thus, upon the principle that Christ is of the same Substance

[k] *Bennet's Iren.* 21. *Cumm.* 1. 223.

with

with the Father; which the Fathers, who first introduced it into the Christian theology, looked upon as a harmless and orthodox opinion; one Error has followed upon another, almost unavoidably; till the Sufferings of Christ, who came down from Heaven, have, for a long time, been denied: and the modern Metaphysicians have at length completed the Antichristian System; by proving from it, that there neither was a Father, who begat; nor a Son, that was begotten by him: but the Son is as unoriginate as the Father himself.

The Opinions of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church being so various and unsatisfactory, I shall now lay before you the Reasoning of those; who have no dependence upon them, but take their Opinions directly from the Scripture.

These all agree; that Christ has said to the *Jews*, in one place, *I and my Father are One*: and, in another place, *my Father is greater than I*. In some places, *He* is called God; and in other places, the *Father* is said to be the only true God, and the God of Christ; and Christ himself calls the Father his God. And the question is at present, as it always has been in former ages, how these Texts are to be reconciled?

Those who suppose the Son to be equal to the Father, argue; that, when God and Christ are said to be One, (*ἓν, unum*, One *Thing*;) the meaning must be, that they are One *God*: and therefore, when it is said, the Father is greater than I; the Son must be considered as speaking of himself, in the capacity of a mere *Man*. For if he were considered as *God*, he must be considered as the *Supreme God*; (because there is but One *God*;) and there can be no greater than He. And since they are the same *God*, and yet cannot be the same *Person*; (for if they were, there would be but One *Person*; and consequently neither Son nor Holy Ghost); their Unity must consist in their being the same *Substance*[*]: For it can consist no where else; there being no other Unity, but that of Substance or Person. Whereas, if Christ be neither the same Substance, nor the same Person; he can be no God at all, but a Creature: and it is Idolatry to worship a Creature; and consequently, their Adversaries are Idolaters.

Those, on the contrary, who believe the Son to be inferior to the Father, as being originate and begotten of the Father; reply to this—first, that it is highly improbable, when Christ said, *my Father*

[*] Note XXXI.

is greater than I; that he should mean to inform his Disciples, that the eternal *God*, Creator of the whole World, was greater than a mortal *Man*, born of a Woman.

2. They affirm; that Christ is not spoken of in Scripture, sometimes as the Supreme God, and sometimes as a mere Man; sometimes as to his Divinity, and sometimes as to his Humanity; but always in one and the same Character; i. e. as one and the same Person; who came down from Heaven, and was incarnate.

3. That although Scripture declares the Father and Son to be ἓν, one *Thing*; yet it neither declares them to be one *God*, nor one *Person*, nor one *Substance*; all these Interpretations being merely human: And therefore, they have the same right to assert, that it does not mean one *God*, or one *Substance*; as their Opposers have to assert, against the *Sabellians*, that it does not mean one *Person*.

4. That the same word ἓν, One, here used concerning God and Christ; is used in other Parts of Scripture, to signify the Unity between the Disciples of Christ; that they may be ἓν, One *Thing*, even as the Father and Son are ἓν, One *Thing*. And in these places it is used in a third Sense; which can neither mean Unity of Substance, nor of Person: And therefore it is a false Conclusion, that because it *does not* mean Unity of *Person*; it *must* mean Unity of *Substance*: because it *may* mean, as it does in several parts of Scripture, Unity of *Will*, *Design*, *Power*, &c. as it does here; where the Unity is said to be [*nature*,] of the same Nature, as between the Father and the Son; and so it is understood by *Calvin* and *Beza*.

5. They affirm, that it is rash and impious to declare; that Christ cannot be *God*, except he be the *self-existent God*; because the Scripture declares him to be *God*, and yet to be the *Son* of *God*: And consequently, he is not the *self-existent God*, but the begotten *Son* of the *self-existent God*: otherwise, he must be his own Father; and his own Son.

Lastly, they say; that, in whatever Sense it is said that *God* and *Christ* are *One*, and that *Christ* is *God*; it will not make an Equality, or Unity, between the *Father* and the *Holy Ghost*; who is neither plainly called *God*, nor said to be *One* with the *Father*, any where in Scripture.

They conclude, therefore, for themselves; that they are not Idolaters, because they believe and worship but one Supreme God; supposing the Son to be *God*, in such an inferior sense of the word, as is consistent

consistent with the Scripture, which declares him to be originate and begotten: and considering the Government of the Universe as a Monarchy under one Person supreme over all. And against their Adversaries they allege, that to suppose the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be each of them *God*, in the highest Sense of the Word, is to suppose them all unoriginate and self-existent: and to worship each of them as *supreme God*, is Tritheism.

From what I have now said, I mean to conclude, in the first place; that the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity, which by false representation hath been so long a stumbling-block to Jews, Mohammedans, and Deists, being looked upon as inconsistent and idolatrous; has nothing, in the genuine Scripture account of it, that is subject to any such objection.

As to the Word itself, indeed, it is well known, that it is not used in the Scripture; and it must be owned, it was very much disliked by some of the Reformers; who looked upon it as a relick of Popery. *Martin Luther* says; "The word *Trinity* sounds oddly, and "is a human invention; it were better to call Almighty God, *God*, "than *Trinity*." And *John Calvin* says, "I like not this Prayer, "O holy, blessed, and glorious *Trinity*; it savours of Barbarism. "The word *Trinity* is barbarous, insipid, profane; a human invention, grounded on no Testimony of God's Word; the Popish "God, unknown to the Prophets and Apostles."[a]

But it may be answered to all this; that so long as the Word is understood in a sense agreable to the Unity of *Jehovah*, and the fundamental Principles of Christianity; it can furnish no argument against the truth of that Religion.

In the next place I would have you observe; that the Doctrine which you accuse the Christians of holding, viz. that *Jesus Christ* is the *supreme God*, is so far from being a doctrine of the new Testament; that it is absolutely inconsistent with the whole Christian system: upon which account those that hold it are obliged either to give up the fundamental principles of Christianity, or to conceal themselves in mystery and darkness. And Dr. *Whitby* tells us, "In "fine, this Doctrine that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are of "one and the same individual and numerical Essence, seems to burlesque the Holy Scriptures, or give them an uncouth and absurd "sense, from the beginning of the Gospel to the end of the Epistles."

a. Unitar. Tracts Vol. I page 17. of the last Tract. Luther. Postill Major. Dominic. Cathin. Admon. 1. ad Polonos.

And this he ſhews in ſeveral inſtances. *Whitby's Laſt Thoughts*, p. 51, &c.

I have now pointed-out to you the moſt remarkable among the various and oppoſite opinions of the Chriſtians; from the beginning of their Diſputes upon the Trinity, and the uſe of that Word in the Chriſtian Church: in order to diſcover, whether there were not ſome one opinion among them conſiſtent with the Prophecies, that the Meſſiah, who came down from Heaven, ſhould ſuffer Pain and Death; and it appears, that ſuch a belief was once held by the firſt Fathers of the Church, before the riſe of the *Arian* Controverſy. But when the Chriſtian Church became corrupted by the *Platonic* Philoſophy; and the Corruptions which were then introduced were eſtabliſhed by human Authority, at the Council of *Nice*, under the pretended influence of the Holy Ghoſt; (when the Son of God was decree'd to be of the ſame generical ſubſtance with the Father, and conſequently impaſſible:) this fundamental article was loſt by degrees, throughout all the Churches in *Chriſtendom*; the Chriſt that came down from Heaven, and was incarnate, and ought to have ſuffered according to the Prophets, was looked-upon to be incapable of ſuffering; and the human nature only, that is, a mere *Man*, who did not come down from Heaven, is now generally ſuppoſed to be the Perſon who ſuffered; according to the Hereſies of *Cerinthus* and *Socinus*. And this Doctrine ſeems at preſent to prevail ſo far over the Truth, which is now looked-upon as Hereſy; that nothing but a direct appeal from human Authority to the Scripture, can ever recover the long-loſt Truth; for the Scripture is the Rock, upon which Chriſtianity was firſt built; and the only Foundation, that is able to ſupport the Superſtructure; and of which a man may ſafely ſay, δὸς πᾶ σῶ, καὶ τὴν γῆν κινήσω· and *That* is the everlaſting Goſpel, and not the decrees of *Nice*, or *Dort*, or *Trent*, or the Church of *England*; by the preaching of which the Kingdoms of the Earth ſhall become the Kingdom of God and his Chriſt. *Rev.* xiv. 6. Sir *I. Newton* on the Apoc. 251.

It is the *genuine* Chriſtianity of the Scriptures, which I have embraced; and not the *artificial* Divinity of the Scholes, or Councils, or particular Churches. What I find in the New Teſtament, that I believe; but what is not to be proved from thence, I look-upon as no Article of my Faith; and by this means clear my hands at once of all the Errors, which have been introduced into Chriſtianity at ſeveral

times

times by authorities which are merely human; and preclude almoſt all the material objections, that have ever been brought againſt it; either by Deiſts, or others.

In the mean time, as *our* Religion is not anſwerable for the Doctrines of the *Talmud*, and the Traditions of the Maſters; ſo neither do I look upon Chriſtianity to be anſwerable for the Doctrines of the Fathers and Councils: moſt of which have been eſtabliſhed by Vote, and Riot, and the Humour of the Times, and the Deference paid to Popes and Emperors, and the then reigning ſyſtems of Politics; rather than the Authority of the Word of God. I confine myſelf therefore in this Apology merely to a defenſe of the Doctrines of the New Teſtament; and know no Authority, but that of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. And indeed I would not pay our own Rabbins ſo bad a compliment; as to ſubmit to any *other* human Authority, after having once rejected *Theirs*.

This was what the learned *Limborch* was obliged ſo often to repeat, in his *Amica Collatio cum erudito Judæo*; and what every man will find it neceſſary to obſerve, if he does not write for a Party; and determine to defend his principles at all events; *per fas atque nefas*: which has already done Chriſtianity ſuch an infinite prejudice.

In your anſwer therefore to theſe Papers, I muſt forewarn you, in the Words of Mr. *Limborch* to *Orobio*, what kind of arguments to uſe, and what to reject. *Omittamus particulares doctorum opiniones, voces ac loquendi phraſes in ſcriptura nunquam uſurpatas, quarum defenſionem in me non ſuſcipio.* (Baſil Edit. p. 555.) Let us leave the particular opinions of the learned; words and phraſes, which are not ever uſed in Scripture; the defenſe of which I do not undertake: And again, *Nos hic autem ſolummodo inquirimus, quid D. Chriſtus ejuſque Apoſtoli credi ab hominibus, ut ſalutem conſequantur, præceperint;—non quid poſteriorum ſeculorum homines auctoritate humana definiverint; quorum decreta fidei Chriſtianæ regula non ſunt, ſed ſola verba Θεοπνευςα, quæ in Apoſtolorum Scriptis reperiuntur.* Teſt. Script. ch. viii. 599. We only inquire what our Lord Chriſt and his Apoſtles commanded to be believed as neceſſary to Salvation, not what men of later ages decree'd by human Authority: whoſe decrees are not the rule of Chriſtian Faith, but only the inſpired words which are found in the Writings of the Apoſtles.

It is a moſt equitable rule, ſays Biſhop *Hoadly*, the great Patron of the civil and eccleſiaſtical Liberties of Mankind; not to lay upon

the Religion of Christ *that which he never himself put into it*; because it was he himself, that was to deliver it from the Father ready framed; and because he never gave Authority, even to the Apostles themselves, to make any Addition to that Scheme of Doctrine and Salvation which he delivered to them. (16 Serm. p. 179.) and Mr. *Chillingworth* says, to the same purpose; "The Bible alone is "the Religion of Protestants: and neither the Doctrine of *Luther* "or *Calvin*, or *Melancthon*, nor the Confession of *Augusta* or *Geneva*, "nor the Catechism of *Heidelberg*, nor the Articles of the Church "of *England*, nor the Harmony of the Protestant Confessions; but "that wherein they all agree with a greater Harmony, as a perfect "Rule of their Faith and Actions; and that is, the BIBLE: the "BIBLE is the only Religion of Protestants." (c. vi. p. 36.)

And Sir *Isaac Newton* says; "The Authority of Emperors, Kings, "and Princes, is *Human*; the Authority of Councils, Synods, Bishops, "and Presbyters, is *Human*; the Authority of the Prophets is *Di-"vine*, and comprehends the Sum of Religion; and if an Angel "from Heaven preach any other Doctrine, let him be accursed." (on the Apoc. p. 14.)

To this let me add the Confession of Faith of the Reformed Churches in *France*; which specifies the Dangers, that Protestants are liable to, and ought particularly to guard against—It is not lawful for Men, nor yet for Angels themselves, either to add to, or to diminish from, or to alter it; (*viz.* the Scripture;) neither may Antiquity, nor Customs, nor Multitude, nor Judgements, nor human Wisdom, nor definitive Sentences, nor Edicts, nor Decrees, nor Councils, nor Visions, nor Miracles, be brought in Opposition to it; but rather, on the contrary, all other Things ought to be examined, regulated, and reformed by it. *Daille Use of the Fathers*, p. 2. p. 129. and Mr. *Charles Drelincourt* quotes the same Words, which he says "their Ancestors presented to their Kings of glorious "Memory;" and adds— "they who are of another Faith, are not "of our Religion;—and—to oblige one's-self to believe without ex-"ception, whatever was believed in any age, whatever, after that of "the Apostles, is to place *Men* upon the Throne of *God*; and transfer "to the Creature the Honour and Glory which belongs to the "Crëator."—"We have often," says he, "protested, and do again "protest, in the face of Heaven and Earth; that we believe nothing "at

"at all neceſſary to the Salvation of our Souls, which is not found "clearly or expreſsly in the Word of God contained in the Scrip-"tures; or is not taken from thence by evident and neceſſary Con-"ſequences." *Du Faux Viſage de l'Antiq.* p. 8, 9, 5.

And the Church of *England* ſpeaks the ſame Language: telling us in the Twentieth Article, That the Church can ordain nothing, *contrary to* Scripture; nor enforce any thing *beſides* Scripture, for neceſſity of Salvation; and in the Twenty-firſt Article, That whatever is ordained even by a general Council, and not taken out of Scripture, hath no Strength or Authority; and conſequently, whenever the Church miſtakes the Senſe of Scripture, her Authority is void.

I have now completed the whole of my Apology, as far as I deſigned to do in this Letter; in which I propoſed to clear myſelf from the Aſperſions, which have been caſt upon my Character; as if I had quitted my belief of the one God *Jehovah*, and joined myſelf to the Tritheiſts. Whereas it appears to me, and I think I have proved; that the Chriſtian Doctrine of the Trinity, as it is reveled in the New Teſtament, is conſiſtent with the Doctrine of the Unity, as reveled by *Moſes*; and I ſhall ſhew in my next Letters, that it is ſo explaned by the moſt antient and moſt eminent among the Chriſtians themſelves. And as to the Idolatry of the Chriſtian Church, and all the Errors of the grand Apoſtaſy; which have laſted ſo many ages, and which I find my friends object to me; they are ſo far from forming any Argument againſt my embracing the Chriſtian Religion, that they appear to me a very ſtrong Confirmation of its Truth; by the Accompliſhment of thoſe Prophecies, which foretold that the Chriſtian Church ſhould be ſo polluted and defaced. And indeed, I look upon Chriſtianity in ſo very different a light from that of a Religion oppoſite to our own; that I find it to be the Completion of ours in its moſt material Articles, to wit, the Return of the viſible *Jehovah*, or Angel of the Covenant, to dwell among us; and the Introduction of the New Covenant which he made with us, ſo plainly foretold in our own Scriptures; *Zach.* ii. 10, 11, *&c.* and upon this account I ſhall undertake to prove, in my Fourth Letter; that if *Chriſtianity* is not *true*, *our* Religion muſt be *falſe*.

To conclude: What the Scheme of Providence hath been from the beginning, and will continue to be to the end of Things, I confeſs

confeſs it is my deſire to know; as far as God hath thought proper to revele it: and I look upon it as my duty to ſtudy his Revelation, and follow it whitherſoever it leads me. And I am perſuaded, that no Man will ever comprehend it; who does not endeavour to enlarge his Mind, by the ſame Spirit of univerſal Benevolence and Love; by which the whole Scheme was at firſt planned, and has ever ſince been directed, by God the Father; and executed by his Son: to throw-off all regard to party and prejudice, and ſets of Texts appropriated to particular Notions; to underſtand all the Doctrines of it, whether they favour Chriſtians, Jews, or Heathens, (for the ſame *Jehovah* is God over all) in a manner conſiſtent with one another, and with the common ſenſe and reaſon of Mankind; and to ſee how they all tend to the ſame great Event; when the Powers of Heaven ſhall be ſhaken, and the Kingdoms of the Earth ſhall become the Kingdom of God and his Chriſt. For till he ſees things in this Order, Perfection, and Conſiſtency, he will have but a very imperfect Notion of the Chriſtian Religion.

The END of the FIRST LETTER.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

I. p. 2. THE ſecond Article of *Sepher Ikkarim* is this: I believe with a perfect Faith, that the Creator (whoſe Name be bleſſed) is one; and that ſuch an Unity, as is in Him, can be found in none other: and that he alone hath been our God, is, and ever ſhall be. See Dr. *Lancelot Addiſon*'s State of the *Jews*; p. 27, 28.

II. p. 2. Here it may be obſerved; that, though the *Athanaſian* Creed tells us, *each perſon of the Trinity is both God and Lord, of himſelf*; yet the Chriſtians allow of no more Gods than one: uſing the word *God*, as it is uſed in the Holy Scriptures, in different ſenſes; ſometimes to ſignify *Jehovah*, and ſometimes *Elohim*, or *Adonai*; and, allowing the Son and Holy Ghoſt to be *each* of them *Elohim*, or *Adonai*, but *one* only to be *Jehovah*; i. e. the Father to be the only *God*, in the higheſt ſenſe of the word, as being unoriginate and ſelf-exiſtent; and the Son and Holy Ghoſt, in a lower ſenſe of the word, as being both originate. See Note XXIX.

III. p. 4. Thus Dr. *L. Addiſon* obſerves, in his Account of the State of the *Jews*, p. 14; "The Bible, the rule of all Reformation, though it be not "denied the people's reading;" (among the *Jews* in *Africa*;) "yet the giving "the ſenſe thereof belongs only to the Maſters; in whoſe interpretation of "the text, the vulgar, upon pain of excommunication, are bound to ac- "quieſce. This was told me, as an *Arcanum Judaiſmi*, by *Aaron Ben Netus*; "a perſon not unlearned in their law." What the conſequence of this ex-

"communi-

communication may be, even in a Chriſtian country, ſee under the article *Acoſta* [*Uriel*] in *Bayle's* Dictionary. Nor are there any *Jews* (in *Africa*) to be met with; who adhere to the old Bible, without *Talmud* traditions. The *Talmud* is as much the Bible of the *Jews*, as the Council of *Trent* is the Bible of the Papiſts. The only people among the *Jews*, who do not thus preſumptuouſly impoſe the interpretations of men as the word of God, are thoſe of the Synagogue of the *Samaritans* at *Sichem*, whom *Cunæus* (de Repub. Hebr. p. 353) ſpeaks of as follows: "*Eſt tamen eorum* (Judæorum) *factio* "*quædam cordatior; ii ſunt* Karaïtæ, *qui, ſpretis hominum placitis, Talmudica* "*præcepta pro nugamentis habent, & nihil admittunt, niſi ſacri codicis conten-* "*tum. Sed id hominum genus cæteris Judæis inviſiſſimum eſt. Itaque cum* "*ſint oppido pauci, ſed ad unum omnes ditiſſimi*; filias ſuas cum dote ſummâ "vix dare nuptum queant. *Hoc, quia ab aliis proditum eſt, non referrem; niſi* "*perſæpe moviſſet riſum.*"

There is a letter from theſe *Karaïtes* to *Joſeph Scaliger*, in a book entitled *Antiquitates Orientalis Eccleſiæ*, &c. p. 122; in which they accuſe the *Jews* of their deſerting the word of God, and truſting in human traditions and interpretations. "*Nos credimus Domino* Moſi *& Monti* Gerizim, *& in eo ado-* "*ramus Dominum*; *verum* Judæi *aliis confidunt: nos nequaquam facimus, niſi* "*juxta mandata Domini in lege ſancta per manum* Moſis; *ſuper quem Pax in* "*æternum.* Judæi *vero deſerunt quod dicit Dominus in lege, & faciunt quem-* "*admodum dicunt eis ſapientes & ſeniores eorum.*"

But ſo great is the inveteracy of the *Jews* to this Sect, and all others who refuſe obedience to the *Talmud* traditions; that they think nothing too bad for them: looking upon them as deniers of the Law, and only fit to be murdered. *Maimonides*, that learned Writer, reckons every one among the Impugners of the Law, (*Legis abnegatores*) *qui negat expoſitionem*, (Legis ſcriptæ;) *ſeu legem ore traditam, atque ejus interpretes falſi arguit: uti* Zadoc & Baitos. *Teſchuva*, Cap. 3. The like is ſaid in *Maſſachet Avoda Zara*, Cap. 2, &c. *Hujuſmodi obſtinatum Traditionis oppugnatorem impune cujuſlibet manu trucidari poſſe aſſerit, in Tract.* Mamrim *ſive de Rebellibus*; (Cap. 3.) *etiamſi nulli adfuerint Teſtes, nullum judicii vel indicii præceſſerit examen; hocque magni beneficii & meriti loco ducit.* Not. *Voſſii*, in *Maimon.* de Fund. Legis, p. 132. See *Prideaux's* Conn. Vol. I. p. 322 and 415.

IV. p. 8. *That the Chriſtians have never agreed upon the ſenſe of the Propoſitions they diſputed about.* —— *Cyril* and *Athanaſius* define a Perſon to be "*Eſſentia cum ſuis quibuſdam proprietatibus, ab iis quæ ſunt ejuſdem ſpeciei nu-* "*mero differens.*" Cudworth, 603. —— Dr. *Waterland* allows Perſon and Intelligent Being to be the ſame, p. 350; *Jackſon*, 352. —— Mr. *Locke* defines Perſon, to be a thinking, intelligent Being; that has Reaſon and Reflection, and can conſider itſelf as itſelf. *Hum. Und.* B. 2, c. 27, 9. —— Mr. *Bidle* ſays; By Perſon, I mean, as Philoſophers do, *Suppoſitum Intelligens*. Unitar. Tracts, Vol. I. p. 17.

The

The *Greeks* ſaid, there were three *Hypoſtaſes*; which the *Latins* rejected, as ſignifying three generical *Subſtances*; and accuſed the *Greeks* of *Arianiſm*. The *Latins* uſed the word *Perſon*; the *Greeks* rejected that; as ſignifying no real, but only a modal diſtinction: and accuſed the *Latins* of *Sabellianiſm*. *Athanaſius* ſummoned a Council upon it, to quiet the diviſion; and it was found, that they were both of the ſame opinion; and only differed about words: upon which the Synod decreed, that thenceforth the *Greek Hypoſtaſis*, and the *Latin Perſona*, ſhould be taken in the ſame ſenſe; to mean particular *Subſtance*. But the Schoolmen have confounded the ſubject more than ever; by explaning *Hypoſtaſis* to ſignify a *Perſon*, diſtinguiſhed from the *Subſtance*; in which ſenſe it is uſed by the *Romiſh* Church; was never uſed before; and is utterly unintelligible.

Mr. *Bennet*, in his *Irenicum*, p. 81, tells us; the *Auguſtan* Confeſſion uſes the word *Perſon*, not for a Part or Quality; but that which properly exiſts.

The *Wirtemberg* Confeſſion ſays, "*tres proprietates per ſe ſubſiſtentes*; but whether the diſtinction of Perſons be *real* or *modal*, is a queſtion.

A learned Controvertiſt ſays; the diſtinction is ſomething leſs than *modal*, and greater than *real*.

Dr. *Scutb* makes the Perſons to be *internal* Relations of the one Subſtance of the Deity to *itſelf*.

Dr. *Wallis* makes them *external* Relations of the one Subſtance of the Deity to *Mankind*.

Zanchy ſays; a *Perſon* is nothing, but the Divine Eſſence; diſtinguiſhed, and as it were individuated, by a certain perſonal property.

Junius thinks; the Perſons are diſtinguiſhed from the Eſſence, *ratione tantum*; *ab invicem reali diſtinctione*: ~~modaliter only~~, but really diſtinguiſhed from one another.

Lud. Capellus ſays; *non re, ſed ratione*.

Mr. *Baxter* ſays; he is paſt doubt, there is in God a Trinity of eſſential, formal, inadequate Conceptions or Primalities; *viz.* vital, active Power, Intellect, and Will.

Others, to avoid the Inconvenience of defining, ſay in general, that there are three *Differences*; as Dr. *Tillotſon*:

Three *Diverſities*; as Biſhop *Burnet*:

Three *Somewhats*; as Dr. *Wallis*:

Three *Subſiſtences*; as Archbiſhop *Secker*.

Mr. *Fran. Cheynel*, in his Book of the Divine Triunity, ſays; "We may "beſt reſemble all that difference, which is between the Eſſence of God, and "the Divine Subſiſtences; by conſidering the tranſcendent affections of "*Ens ſimpliciter*, and the Attributes of God; who doth infinitely tranſcend "not only a prædicamental Subſtance, but a metaphyſical Entity; as the moſt "metaphyſical men, who are found in the Faith, do honeſtly confeſs.

"Concerning the tranſcendental affections of *Ens*, which are *unum verum bonum*,

" *bonum*, we ſay; theſe three Affections, and *Ens in Latitudine*, do not make " four things really diſtinct; and yet we ſay, they are real and poſitive " Affections." [and this is called *explaning*.] St. *Auſtin*, being aſked what the three are, ſays; human learning is ſcanty, and affords not terms to expreſs it; 'tis therefore anſwered three Perſons, not as if that was to the purpoſe; but Somewhat muſt be ſaid, and we muſt not be ſilent. *De Trin.* L. v. c. 9.

The word *Homöouſios*, or *Conſubſtantial*, was no more determinate than the word *Perſon*. It was rejected by the Eighty Fathers, as *Sabellian*; and within fifty years was made the teſt of *Orthodoxy*. It was underſtood by the *Athanaſians*, to ſignify the ſame kind of Subſtance, as the trunk and the branches and leaves of a Tree; or the Sun, its light, and derivative light; yet ſo exiſting, as that the ſecond and third ſhould depend on its original; as the light upon the ſun.—By *Gregory Nyſſen*, *Cyril*, &c. it was underſtood to mean the ſame kind of ſubſtance, exiſting independently; as three men. 3. By the *Montaniſts* it was underſtood, that the Son and Spirit exiſted as parts of the divine Subſtance. 4. By the *Sabellians*, as one and the ſame identical whole Subſtance. 5. By *Euſebius*, merely that the Son was not of the Subſtance of the Creatures; dividing all Subſtance into crëated or divine. 6. By the *Lateran* Council, in a ſenſe, if intelligible, very little, if at all, different from the *Sabellians*, and the ancient opinion of *Samoſatenus*.

Nature is another technical term, much uſe'd in the diſpute between the *Eutychians* and *Neſtorians*; and the meaning of it is as uncertain. *De Rodon*, a learned *Frenchman*, ſays; it is taken in *nine* ſenſes: and Mr. *R. Baxter* ſays, " the Senſe was not agree'd-on; before they diſputed the matter. Though " the *Neſtorians* ſtill go for deſperate Heretics, I verily believe," ſays Mr. *Baxter*; " that all the quarrel was about ambiguous words." And ſo Mr. *Sale* obſerves, in his preliminary diſcourſe to the *Koran*; and quotes *Simon*'s *Hiſt. Crit. de la Creance, & du Levant*, to the ſame purpoſe. See *Jackſon*, p. 176, 374.

And it will appear ſtill plaher, how few men were capable of underſtanding theſe diſputes; if we conſider the Nicety of expreſſion, with which they were managed.

Neſtorius believed, the divine and human Natures of Chriſt were united; *non hypoſtaſi, ſed habitudine*. *Eutyches* was condemned for affirming, that Chriſt had but one Nature; after the two Natures were united. *Dioſcurus* ſaid, *Ex duabus (Naturis) ſuſcipio, duas non ſuſcipio*: That Chriſt is of two Natures; but not that he is or has two Natures. The *Eutychians* ſaid, he was *ex duabus Naturis*; others, *in duabus Naturis*: And *Cyril* reproves *Neſtorius*; for aſſerting only an union *ſecundum perſonam*, and not *ſecundum naturam*: and one of *Quintianus*'s Anathemas was; If any ſay God Man, and not God and Man; let him be damned. *Baxter*, Ch. II. 120.

On this queſtion depended another; Whether the Virgin *Mary* was the Mother

Mother of God, as *Cyril* expreſſed it; or the Mother of Chriſt, who was God, according to *Neſtorius*. This being a difficulty, Mr. *Baxter* thus explanes it. He ſays, *Cyril* ſpake *de concreto*; and *Neſtorius*, *de abſtracto*; one ſpake *materially*, the other *formally*. They both mean'd, that *Mary* was the mother of Chriſt, who was God; but not the Chriſt, as God; or of the Deity. One underſtood it of Chriſt, *qui Deus*; and the other of Chriſt, *qud Deus*.

This diſpute aroſe again in other ſhapes. In the days of *Hormiſda*, there was a queſtion; Whether it might be ſaid, that *one of the Trinity was crucified?* the *Neſtorians* laid hold of this, and ſaid; If we may not ſay this, then we may not ſay, that *Mary* was the Parent of one of the Trinity. *Juſtinian* ſent about this to *John*; and he held a Synod upon it: and it was agree'd; that they might ſay, contrary to *Hormiſda*, *that one of the Trinity was crucified*.

In the 5th general Council of *Conſtantinople*, *Theodoret* was accuſed for ſaying, that *Mary* begat not God, in the Nature of God; but Man, as united to the Godhead.

Theſe diſputes begat another; Whether Chriſt, being God and Man, had one or two Operations or Wills. The difficulty was; that one Operation, or Will, ſeemed to aſſert one Nature; which was condemned in *Eutyches*: and two Operations, or Wills, ſeemed to aſſert two Perſons; which was condemned in *Neſtorius*. And in this queſtion they were ſo confounded; that, at the ſixth general Council of *Conſtantinople*, *Macarius*, Patriarch of *Antioch*, profeſſed, that he would ſooner be caſt into the ſea; than aſſert, there were two Wills in Chriſt; thinking he held with *Cyril* and the firſt *Epheſian* Council. But this was not ſufficient: for though *Cyril* was called Orthodox, who was proved to aſſert *one Nature of God incarnate, after the Union*; yet thoſe that ſaid as he, and much leſs, were damned Heretics: and thoſe that allowed two Natures, after the Reſurrection, and denied two Wills, were damned with the reſt. *after*

And yet in another Council, where *Binius* ſays there were innumerable Biſhops; they all condemned the ſixth general Council, and their opinion of two Wills, and two Operations.

In ſhort, the Chriſtians had ſo confounded themſelves in theſe diſputes about Words, without defining the meaning of them; that, as Mr. *Baxter* ſays of the firſt Council of *Sirmium*, "they knew not who were, nor who were not, Heretics: and the moſt violent Perſecutors, ſuch as *Cyril* and *Neſtorius*, *&c.* at length fell into the ſnare into which they had driven others; and it was almoſt impoſſible to avoid Condemnation, after being once ſingled out to be hunted down; a mere toſs of the die, who were orthodox, and who were not: Biſhops, and Popes, and Emperors, whether dead or alive, and even general Councils, ſhared the ſame fate. And theſe were the kind of Queſtions; upon which the Chriſtians thought they did God ſervice, by fining, impriſoning, and murdering one another.

V. p. 11. *Of the word* Creature. —— Among the Heathen Philoſophers, the word *Creature* had two very different ſenſes. The firſt was large and indefinite: every Being was called a Creature, that was not ſelf-exiſtent, and unoriginate; whether produced *in* time, or *before* time; and whether ſuppoſed conſubſtantial with the ſupreme God, or not.

Plato ſuppoſed Matter and Spirit (ὕλη & ψυχὴ, the Subſtances of all things, whether material or immaterial) to be eternal; and ſo, it ſeems, did *Origen*; (ſee *Dupin*, p. 135;) and in this ſenſe, the inferior Gods, who were believed to be formed before all Time, out of ψυχὴ, the Soul of the World, are called by him ἀγένητοι, ἀΐδιοι, ἀίδιοι; uncreated, immortal, and eternal: but yet, as they were originally made into Gods, they were conſidered as Creatures, or created Beings; notwithſtanding the divine Subſtance, out of which they were made, was ſuppoſed to be unoriginate, and eternal: to which purpoſe may be quoted that famous expreſſion of *Plato*, ſo much cited by the ancient Writers, Θεοὶ Θεῶν, ὧν ἐγὼ δημιουργὸς Gods of Gods, whom I have created: ſo *Stobæus* ſays, "the Multitude of Gods is the work of the *Demiurgus*; made by him together with the world." *Cudworth*, 462. And yet theſe inferior Gods were ſuppoſed to be conſubſtantial with the ſupreme God: and, in like manner, many of the Fathers ſuppoſed, Angels, and the Souls of men, were generated from the divine Subſtance; but not therefore uncreated Beings. See Dr. *Cudworth*, p. 254.

In the ſecond ſenſe of the word *Creature*, which was lower, vulgar, and limited, the word Creature mean'd ſuch Beings only; as were made in Time, and were of a corrupt and periſhable nature. And in this ſenſe the *Orthodox* impute it to the *Arians*, that they believe the Son of God to be a Creature: but the *Arians* deny it; declaring him, as *Eunomius* ſays, to be γέννημα τῦ ἀγεννήτε, οὐχ ὡς ἓν τῶν γεννημάτων· κτίσμα τῦ ἀκτίσ-υ, οὐχ ὡς ἓν τῶν κτισμάτων· ποίημα τῦ ἀποίητε, οὐχ ὡς ἓν τῶν ποιημάτων· καθὼς ἄρτι ὑπὸ τῆς ἁγίας γραφῆς, Κύριος ἔκτισε με. *Prov.* viii. 22. The *Arians* therefore did not believe Chriſt to be a Creature, in this low ſenſe of the word; but in the ſame ſenſe in which it was ſuppoſed to be uſed of him in the *Proverbs*, according to the LXX tranſlation.

Philo Judæus believed the *Word of God* to be neither uncreated and eternal, in the ſenſe in which the *ſupreme God* is ſo; i. e. unoriginately; nor yet a Creature, as other Creatures made in Time, and of a corruptible nature; but of a middle nature, between both: οὔτε ἀγέννητος, ὡς Θεὸς, οὐδὲν ἧττον γένητος, ὡς ἡμεῖς· ἀλλὰ μέσος τῶν ἄκρων· being neither uncreated, as God is; nor created, as We are: but the middle of the two extremes, between the Maker and the thing made. See *Philalethes Cantab.* on Dr. *Waterland*'s ſecond Defenſe.

As the ancient Fathers underſtood the words, Θεὸς ἔκτισέ με, *Prov.* viii. 22, to be mean'd of the Son of God; and *Col.* i. 15, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως· they did not ſcruple to ſay, that Chriſt was created. The *Apoſtolic Conſtitutions* ſtile him, *that Wiſdom which God created*; and *Melito*, Biſhop of *Sardis*, about

about the year 182, wrote a Book, περὶ λόγου Χριστοῦ of the Creation of Christ; *Reply to Waterland*, 326: and *Tertullian*, though he expreſsly affirms the Son to be of the Father's Subſtance, yet calls him *factum & conditum*: and ſo *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen*, and others; as the word was uſed by the *Platoniſts*; when they ſay of the firſt Cauſe, *de ſe mentem creaſſe*; believing, that *Mens* was not created from nothing; but was derived from the Firſt Cauſe. See *Cudworth*, 576. According to this Philoſophy, though the Son of God was believed to be eternal, and conſubſtantial with the Father; it was no proof that he was not a Creature; the word Creation being uſed, as well to ſignify, a Production from the divine Subſtance, as a Creation from nothing.

VI. p. 11. *Of the words* Eternal, *and* without a Beginning.——The *Orthodox*, as I have obſerved, had two ſenſes to this word; which they uſed, as beſt ſuited their conveniences. Sometimes, in an abſolute ſenſe; as when they ſpake of the eternal exiſtence of the Son, as being the divine attribute of Wiſdom, exiſting in the Father by neceſſity of nature; and conſequently unoriginate and unbegotten. But they did not dare to uſe thoſe words; for fear of the conſequences: for, if he were unoriginate and unbegotten, he muſt either be the Father himſelf; which is *Sabellianiſm*: or, if different from the Father, then there muſt be two unoriginate Beings; *i. e.* two ſupreme Gods. And yet this is the ſenſe in which *Athanaſius* argues, when he ſays of the Son of God; εἰ ἀΐδιος ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς, οὐκ ἦν κτίσμα· εἰ δὲ κτίσμα τυγχάνει, οὐκ ἦν ἀΐδιος: If the Son be eternal, he was not created; and if he was created, he was not eternal: For if ἀΐδιος does not mean an abſolute Eternity, but only an Exiſtence before all ages; as it was uſed by the Philoſophers; there is no abſurdity, in ſuppoſing the Son to be both eternal, and created. The Ancients believed the World to be eternal, and alſo to be made; *Cudworth*, 254: and the *Platoniſts* believed the ſame of the inferior Gods; ſee Note V: and when the *Orthodox* ſpake of the eternal Generation of the Son, they then uſed the word *Eternal* in a more lax ſenſe, to mean a generation before all ages; and not an abſolute Eternity. For both the *Athanaſians* and *Arians* believed; there was ſome *Time*, or rather ſome *Duration*, prior to *Time*, before his eternal Generation; otherwiſe *Athanaſius* could not ſpeak of him, as exiſting firſt, and afterwards begotten into a Son; ὅτε πρότερον, ὕστερον γεννηθέντα εἰς υἱὸν· (*Athan.* de Syn. Arim. & Seleuc. & *Hil.* de Trin. lib. 4: Reply to *Waterland*, by *Jackſon*, 125) nor the Emperor *Conſtantine* ſay, that he was in the Father, πρὶν γεννηθῆναι, before he was begotten; nor *Arius*, ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν· and therefore, if the word is uſed in an abſolute ſenſe, *Athanaſius* is to be anſwered by the ſame argument as he uſes againſt the *Arians*; εἰ ἀΐδιος ἐστιν, οὐκ ἦν γεννητός· εἰ δὲ γεννητὸς τυγχάνει, οὐκ ἦν ἀΐδιος. If he is eternal, he is unbegotten; (for he exiſted before he was begotten; and conſequently, he was unbegotten:) and if begotten, then not eternal; (for there was duration, before he was begotten.) The

argument

argument is equally ſtrong againſt the *Athanaſians*, as the *Arians*. In ſhort, it is from the abſolute Eternity of God, that we prove him to be independent, and ſelf-exiſtent. But if a Being, who was begotten, and is dependent on another for his Exiſtence, can be abſolutely Eternal; no ſuch deduction can be made: nor can any independent Being be proved to exiſt.

On the other hand; when the *Athanaſians* endeavour to clear themſelves of this difficulty, by defining the words ἀΐδιον and ἀναρχον; they clear the *Arians*, at the ſame time: as appears from what is ſaid by *Alexander* of *Alexandria*, and *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea*; who ſtile the Generation of the Son, ἀΐδιον, and ἀναρχον; Eternal, and Beginningleſs. *Alexander* ſays, μὴ τις τὸ ἀεὶ πρὸς ὑπόνοιαν ἀγεννήτου λαμβανέτω — οὔτε γὰρ τὸ ἦν, οὔτε τὸ ἀεὶ, οὔτε τὸ πρὸ αἰώνων ταυτόν ἐστι τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ. Epiſt. apud *Theodoret. Philal. Cant.* p. 67. Let no one underſtand the expreſſion *exiſting always*, to ſignify being unbegotten—for neither the word *was*, nor *always*, nor *before all ages*, is the ſame as Unbegotten.—And *Euſebius* ſays, as quoted by *Philal. Cant.* p. 67. υἱὸν γεννητὸν, ἢ χρόνοις μέν ποτε οὐκ ὄντα, ὕστερον δὲ ποθὲν γεγονέναι· ἀλλὰ πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων ἐκτὸς, καὶ προόντα, καὶ τῷ πατρὶ ὡς ὑὸν διαπαντὸς συνόντα, καὶ ἐκ ἀγεννήτου ὄντα, γεννώμενον δὲ (falſely printed, γεννωμεν) ἐξ ἀγεννήτου πατρός—πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς ἀρρήτου καὶ ἀπεριλήπτου βουλῆς καὶ δυνάμεως ὑποστάντα. *Dem. Evang.* Lib. 4. c. 3. The Son was begotten; not as if he was at any time not exiſting, and afterwards begotten; but exiſting *before all ages*, and being preexiſtent, and exiſting always as a Son with the Father; [which *Athanaſius*, and many of the Orthodox, deny;] not being unbegotten, but begotten of the unbegotten Father; having his Subſiſtence by the ineffable and incomprehenſible will and power of the Father. And again, ὁ δὲ πατὴρ προϋπάρχει τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ προϋφέστηκεν, ἅτε μόνος ἀγέννητος ὤν. καὶ ὁ μὲν καθ' ἑαυτὸν τέλειος, καὶ πρῶτος ὡς πατὴρ, καὶ τῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ ὑπάρξεως αἴτιος — ὁ δὲ ὡς ἐξ αἰτίου γεγονὼς υἱὸς, δεύτερος ἤδη ἐστὶν υἱὸς καθιστάμενος. But the Father exiſts *before* the Son, and ſubſiſted *before* his Generation, as being *alone* unoriginated; and he is perfect (God) of *himſelf*; and *firſt*, as being *Father*, and *cauſe* of the Exiſtence of the Son—but the Son, as *being derived from a Cauſe*, is *Second* after him whoſe Son he is.

From all this it is plane, that the *Arians* allow the Eternity of the Son; in the ſame ſenſe of the word, as the *Orthodox* allow his eternal Generation; *i. e.* they allow it in the higheſt ſenſe of the word, that comes ſhort of unoriginate, and ſelf-exiſtent: and the *Athanaſians* do not believe the Son to be unoriginate, or ſelf-exiſtent; any more than the *Arians*.

It is ſaid; that God, from all Eternity, could act; and therefore, the Effect of that act would be eternal. But this is not true; in the ſtrict philoſophic ſenſe: becauſe the very act would be a date, or given moment, from which to reckon, down even to the preſent year. The caſe is the ſame; in regard to Extenſion. Though a line be infinitely extended; yet no point can be given in it, which ſhall be at an infinite diſtance from another given point in the ſame line. Fix the point, where you will; there will be a line

before

before it. And the performance of an Act is the same thing, with regard to Eternity, as the fixing of a Point is, to infinite Extension: it makes the Duration definite, as fixing the Point in a line does the Longitude; you may measure back to that point: and, if it were not so, a part would be equal to the whole, and a finite to an infinite: which is absurd. There is a great difference, between having from eternity a power of acting; and having a power of producing an Effect, which effect shall be eternal.

But supposing that such an effect could properly be called eternal, yet it could not be called ἀναρχον, in the strict philosophic sense, *i. e.* without beginning: for that word does most certainly, in the strict sense, include the idea of unoriginate and self-existent; and, consequently, such an assertion must allow of two Gods. But if we leave Philosophy, and consider the words in the Scripture sense of them; the Beginning will signify, the Creation of all things by Jesus Christ: and the words ἀΐδιον, and ἀναρχον, will relate to the Duration before that Creation, or before all ages; and Christ, who existed before that Creation, will be ἀϊδιος and ἀναρχος.

Plato says; When God made and contemplated the Universe, he rejoiced over it, and then he made Time, *&c. Essay on Spirit*, 128: and 'tis probable, the *Beginning*, mentioned by *Moses*, is only considered by him, as relating to the Creation of *this* World; in which there is no mention of the creating Angels, or any other Beings. And St. *John*, it is probable, goes no higher; *John* i. 1. So that when the Scripture speaks of other Beings, which existed before the world, having no measures of *Time*, whereby to denote the different durations of their existence, (*Gen.* i. 14) they say of them all, that they existed in [or before] the *Beginning*; or before the *World* was; or of *Old*, or from *Everlasting*. *Gen.* i. 1; *John* i. 1; xvii. 5; *Prov.* viii. 22, 23; *Psalm* xciii. 2, in *Ainsworth*; *Isaiah* xliv. 8; *&c.* And in this sense, the Gospel is called everlasting; *Rev.* xiv. 6; αιωνιον; because it was promised προ χρονων αιωνιων, *Tit.* i. 2; *i. e.* before all time: in which sense the word was understood by *Chrysostom*; who tells us, St. *Paul* calls that, which existed before all Ages, *eternal*; for in another place he says; "He that existed before all Ages. The Son therefore will be found, in this sense, to be *eternal*: and he [St. *Paul*] saith of him, that by him he made the Ages. Now, it is manifest, that the Maker exists before the things made. ——But what is mean'd by *the Age*, or Αιών? It is Time, in days and hours." Το δε προ αιωνων, αϊδιον φησι· η γαρ αλλαχου ουτω φησιν, ο υπαρχων προ των αιωνων· ευρησεις και ο υιος ουτως αϊδιος ων. Και γαρ περι αυτου φησιν, ου δι αυτου τους αιωνας εποιησεν· ωστερ ουν, προ των αιωνων υπαρχειν. Ο γαρ ποιησας προ των ποιημαλων ην δηλον οτι. Tom. iii. Orat. 7, in 1 *Cor.* ii. 6. Τι ποτε εστιν αιων, ειπε μοι; χρονος εν ημεραις και ωραις. Tom. iii, in *Gal.* i. 4. So Bishop *Burnet* makes Duration before all Time to be *eternal*;—on *Art.* 11. and *Le Clerc* says, it was so understood, in the days of *Constantine*. "When the Fathers call the Son *eternal*; which, I think, is not above once or twice in all their writings; they mean, that he was made by the Father; in

? Bibl. Univ. X. 445

in that Duration, which Philoſophy calls Eternity; ſome ſpace before the preſent World was made." *Second Collection of Unitarian Tracts*, p. 88. Archbiſhop *Tillotſon* ſays; "He did exiſt, before any thing was made; and conſequently, is without Beginning, or Eternal." *Of the Divine Incarnation*, p. 119; *Vindication of Archbiſhop* Tillotſon's *Sermons*, p. 22.

The third *Sirmian* Creed ſeems to expreſs this the moſt intelligibly of any thing I have met with on the ſubject; viz. that the Son was, *ante omnia ſecula & initia, ante omne tempus quod in intellectum cadere poteſt, & ante omnem comprehenſibilem ſubſtantiam*. Before all Ages and Beginning, and all Time that we can conceive, and all Subſtance that we can comprehend. And this is as high a ſenſe, as the words are capable of; without ſuppoſing them to mean, that Chriſt is unoriginate and ſelf-exiſtent: which is denied by the *Athanaſians*, as well as the *Arians*.

VII. p. 11. *Of the* Generation *of the Son of God.* ——In regard to this, Biſhop *Pearſon* ſays; the Communication of the divine Eſſence by the Father was the true and proper *Generation*, by which he hath begotten a Son.—A *Son* is nothing but another produced by his *Father*, of the ſame nature with him.—But God the *Father* hath communicated to the *Word* the ſame divine Eſſence, by which he is *God*: p. 137: and p. 34 he ſays; the *Father* hath the Eſſence or Attributes, of himſelf; and the *Son*, by communication from the Father. —But Dr. *Waterland*, though he ſpeaks of a threefold *Generation* of the Son; two antemundane, and one in the fleſh; yet, when he comes to explane himſelf, denies any literal *Generation* of the Son at all: for he ſuppoſes his being in the Father, before he was generated, to be the firſt and moſt proper Filiation or Generation; which he allows to be a mere coëxiſtence with the Father, and not any Derivation from him.—His ſecond Generation he ſuppoſes to be, his Manifeſtation to create; which is no Generation. And, thirdly, his Manifeſtation in the fleſh, to govern his creatures; which he explanes to be nothing but a Miſſion, Manifeſtation, or Exertion, or taking a new office: and ſays; there is no change at all in it, no not ſo much as in any mode of exiſtence; but he was as much and truly generated before as after it. (See *Obſervations on Dr.* Waterland's *Second Defence*, p. 58, 59, 69, 72.) Thus, in fact, he allows of a *figurative*, but of no *literal* Generation of the Son; either temporal or eternal. See *Philal. Cant. Farther Remarks*, p. 40, and *Firſt Part*, p. 41.

VIII. p. 15. *Of the Trinity of one ſingular Eſſence.*——The word Ὁμοούσιος, or *Conſubſtantial*; which was oppoſed by the *Nicene* Fathers, on one ſide, to the words ἑτεροούσιος, and ἀλλοιούσιος, of a *different* Subſtance; which contained the opinion of *Arius*: and, on the other ſide, to ταυτοούσιος, and μονοούσιος, of one and the *ſame* Subſtance; which contained the opinion of *Sabellius*: could not poſſibly mean a ſingular exiſtent or individual Eſſence, or any thing elſe but the ſame generical Eſſence; which the *Platoniſts* expreſſed by the γενότης, and the *Athanaſians* by ὁμοειδὴς, ὁμογενὴς, ὁμοφυὴς.

ὁμοούσιος. And the words of the Council of *Chalcedon* are capable of no other meaning; ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα· consubstantial with the Father, as to his Godhead; and consubstantial with Us, as to his Manhood.

The words of *Athanasius* are these; Οὐδὲ γὰρ υἱὸν πατρὶ φρονοῦμεν, ὡς οἱ Σαβέλλιοι, μονούσιον καὶ οὐχ ὁμοούσιον. *We do not think the Son to be really one and the same with the Father, as the* Sabellians *do; and to be Monoöusios, not Homoöusios, they thereby destroying the very Being of the Son.* Expos. Fidei, p. 241.—And *Epiphanius* makes the same remark: and says; Καὶ ὁ λέγομεν ταυτόσιον, ἵνα μὴ ἡ λέξις παρὰ τῶν λεγόντων Σαβελλίου ἀπεικασθῇ· ταυτὸν δὲ λέγομεν τῇ θεότητι, καὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ, καὶ τῇ δυνάμει. *We affirm not the Son to be the same in Substance with the Father; least this should be taken in way of compliance with* Sabellius: *nevertheless we do assert him to be the same in Godhead, and in Essence, and in Power.* Cudw. 611. Accordingly, Dr. *Cudworth* draws this conclusion: It is plane, that the ancient orthodox Fathers asserted no such thing, as one and the same singular or numerical Essence of the several Persons of the Trinity: this, according to them, being not a real Trinity, but a Trinity of mere names, notions, and inadequate conceptions only. And p. 598, he says; To consider the Trinity to be so undivided, as if Three were not Three in it, is to make the mystery contemptible: [for then the Trinity would not be a Trinity;] and if the whole Trinity be One, as each single Person therein is One in himself; then there must be a Trinity in each Person.——These Fathers, it is plane, asserted a specific Unity only, and not a numerical one: and nothing can be more contrary to this, than the doctrine of the *Lateran* Council, which is generally looked upon as orthodox, and particularly is espoused by Dr. *Waterland*; that the Father and Son are *una summa res*: [Defence of his Quer.] and that the Son may be justly called the Father's Substance, p. 379, 380, 391.

We are told by the great *Basil*, Epist. ccc; that the word Ὁμοούσιος corrects the impiety of *Sabellius*; for it takes away the Identity of Substance, and introduces a perfect notion of the Persons. For the same thing is not [indeed, cannot be] consubstantial to itself; but one thing to another. Αὕτη δὲ ἡ φωνὴ, καὶ τὸ τῶν Σαβελλίου κακὸν ἐπανορθοῦται· ἀναιρεῖ γὰρ τὴν ταυτότητα τῆς ὑποστάσεως, καὶ παρέχει τελείαν τῶν προσώπων τὴν ἔννοιαν. Οὐ γὰρ αὐτό τί ἐστιν ἑαυτῷ ὁμοούσιον, ἀλλ' ἕτερον ἑτέρῳ. *Bulli* Op. 31.—Accordingly he says; God is not One in *Number*; but only in *Nature*. *Epist.* 141, *ad* Cæsar. and so says *Justin*; Θεὸς τῷ πλείους ἀριθμῷ, ἑνὶ γνώμῃ.

All these writers therefore agree, to reject a numerical Unity of Substance, as the doctrine of *Sabellius*; and to admit only a generical or specific Unity: and it was understood, in the Councils of *Nice* and *Chalcedon*, as in the words just quoted: and even Dr. *Waterland* says; the Substance of the One Person is not the Substance of either of the others; but different; however of the same kind, or united. *Philal. Cant.* p. 14. And Bishop *Bull* supposes the same; and that they are joined together by a *Perichorésis*. *Bulli* Op. 130,

285. But Dr. *Whitby* obſerves, very juſtly; that "Three Eſſences cannot "be One, and no more; by being *connexé & conjunctè*:" (*Laſt Thoughts*, p. 6) and, in his Preface to the ſame book, he ſays; "It is evident, from "the words of *Athanaſius* and *Epiphanius*;" [which are quoted above;] "that "the doctrine of the *Sabellians* was exactly the ſame with that of thoſe who "ſtile themſelves the *Orthodox*; aſſerting, that the Father and the Son are "*numerically* one and the ſame God: both of them teſtifying, that to ſay "the Father and the Son were μονοουσιον, or ταυτοουσιοι, of one and the "ſame Subſtance," [which is the doctrine of the *Lateran* Council and the *Romiſh* Church;] "was *Sabellianiſm*. And to contend, that this is the doc-"trine of the Church of *England*, is to diſhonour our Church; and in ef-"fect to charge her with that Hereſy: which was exploded with ſcorn by "the whole Church of Chriſt, from the third to this preſent century."

IX. p. 22. *Of the* Arians.——As the *Arians* are accuſed by the *Orthodox*, of not giving a fair account of their Faith; let us ſee, in the firſt place, whether the *Orthodox* have done it more honeſtly and preciſely.——Biſhop *Pearſon* ſays; the Hereſy of *Arius*, as it was condemned by the Council of *Nice*, is known to all, p. 187: and again; the Hereſy is ſo well known, that it needs no explication: and indeed, it cannot be better deſcribed, than in the Anathematiſm of the *Nicene* Council. That Decree is as follows: Τους δε λεγοντας, Ην ποτε ὁτε ουκ ην ὁ Υἱος του Θεου· και πριν γεννηθηναι ουκ ην· και ὁτι ἐξ ουκ ὀντων ἐγενετο, ἡ ἐξ ἑτερας ὑποστασεως, ἡ ουσιας φασκοντας ειναι, ἡ κτιστον, ἡ ἀλλοιωτον, ἡ τρεπτὸν τον Υἱον του Θεου· τουτους ἀναθεματιζει ἡ καθολικη και ἀποστολικη Ἐκκλησια. The Catholic Apoſtolic Church anathematiſes thoſe who ſay; there was [a time] when he [the Son of God] was not; and that he did not exiſt before he was begotten: or that ſay; he was of a different *Hypoſtaſis*, or *Ouſia*; or was created, or liable to change.——Whether this was charged upon *Arius*, as his opinion, by the *Nicenes*; or mean'd alſo to diſculpate themſelves; does not appear: but the Biſhop ought to have known; that the opinion of *Arius* was very different from what is there condemned: *viz.* that God did *ante ſempiterna tempora unigenitum filium gignere; per quem & ſecula & reliqua omnia procreavit: viz. ſubſiſtentem illum ſuapte voluntate condidiſſe ejuſmodi ut neque converti neque mutari poſſit.* 2 Ep. *Ar.* in Epiph.; *Baxter's* Ch. Hiſt. p. 48. Now, if it was the opinion of *Arius*, that the Son was immutable; how could Biſhop *Pearſon* refer us to the Anathematiſm of the *Nicene* Council, for his opinion; as if it was there deſcribed?

Secondly: It is obſervable; that *Hilary* has tranſlated the words, ἀλλοιωτον, ἡ τρεπτὸν τον Υἱον του Θεου, by *convertibilem & mutabilem Deum*; inſtead of *Dei filium*; and thereby deſcribed a Hereſy, that never exiſted. The Hereſy, condemned by the *Nicene* Council, did not concern any opinion about *God*; but his Son: for no-body ever held, that there was a time when *God* was not; or that He was not, before he was begotten. And if *Hilary* mean'd, by this omiſſion, to charge *Arius* with the notion, that God was himſelf *mutabilis*

mutabilis & convertibilis; it was a *coup de maitre*: for he muſt have known, that this was the very accuſation which *Arius* brought againſt the *Athanaſians*; and upon account of which he rejected their opinions: as he himſelf declares, in his letter to Biſhop *Alexander*.

Thirdly; Dr. *Cave* has given us the Creed of *Eunomius*, as already quoted: and yet, in ſight of the very words of it which confeſs Chriſt to be God, he ſays of him; *iſtud vero argumentum præ aliis jactitat, quod ex prima Idea Dei, Deum ἀγέννητον eſſe pateat: Chriſtus autem non eſt ἀγέννητος ergo non Deus.* But *Eunomius* uſes no ſuch argument; and aſſerts the direct contrary.—The Doctor, to prove his aſſertion, quotes as follows; ἅντε γὰρ ἀγέννητος, οὐκ υἱὸς· ἅντε υἱὸς, οὐκ ἀγέννητος. In which *Eunomius* argues very juſtly; "if unbegotten, then not a Son: and if a Son, then "not unbegotten:" inſtead of which, the Doctor has made him ſay, in flat contradiction to his own Creed; "*If not begotten, then not God.*" Whereas *Eunomius* aſſerts the Son to be both God, and alſo begotten; through his whole apology, as well as his *Fides Expoſita*. In one place he ſays, "from his "being a Son and begotten, he is the only begotten God;" and again, "he is the Lord and King of Glory; as being the Son of God and God." *Fab. Bib. Græ.* vol. viii. p. 256. and in another place, he calls him true God: "and we believe alſo in the Son *of God*, the only begotten God; the Firſt "Born of the whole Creation, Chriſt true God not unbegotten." *Ibid.* 255. To what purpoſe now is all this chicanery and miſrepreſentation; if all is mean'd to be fair and honeſt? But in truth, the orthodox writers are ſo jealous of the *Arians'* opinions; that they ſcarce ever repreſent them, as the *Arians* themſelves expreſs them.

I ſhall examine their real opinions; particularly what Dr. *Cave* gives us of them, in the words of *Arius*: and ſhew, wherein they differ from what has been looked-upon to be orthodox.

Now, firſt; as the *Arians* believed the divine Subſtance of the Father to be ἀγέννητος, unbegotten, and ἀναίτιος, without Beginning; they concluded, that it was different from the Subſtance of the Son; who was begotten, and had a Beginning: and agreably to this notion, they ſaid; Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐστιν ἴσος, ἀλλὰ μὴ ὁμοούσιος αὐτῷ—καὶ οὐσίας οὐκ ἐστιν ἴδιος τῆς παιδὸς οὐσίας—ξένος τῆς υἱῆς καὶ οὐσίαν ὁ πατήρ. And he adds the reaſon; Ὅτι ἄναρχος ὑπάρχει. "He is not equal to the Father, nor conſubſtantial with him—he is "not of the Father's Subſtance—the Father is different in Subſtance; be- "cauſe he is without Beginning." But the *Athanaſians* believed the Father and Son to be of the ſame Subſtance; that is, of the ſame *generical* Subſtance; as two Men are of the ſame Subſtance: and the *Pſeudoathanaſians* believe them to be of the ſame identical *numerical* Subſtance.

Secondly: As the *Arians* believed the divine Subſtance of the Father to be indiviſible and uncompounded; they could not believe the Son to be generated of or from it, in any *literal* ſenſe; either as being compounded with it, or divided from it: and therefore they concluded, that the Generation of the Son was *figurative*; and was not a Participation of Subſtance,

ſtance, but a Creation; as the word *Creation* is frequently uſed in Scripture, with regard to Mankind. And they confirmed this from *Prov.* viii. 22. Θεὸς ἔκτισέ με, &c. according to the *Septuagint* reading; the Lord *created* me, &c. And becauſe they believed it blaſphemous to ſay, that this Generation was out of the indiviſible Subſtance of the Father; and no other Subſtance then exiſted—they ſaid, Οὐκ ἐξ ὄντος τοῦ πατρὸς, ἀλλ' ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ὑπέστη· ἢ αὐτὸς οὐκ ἔστιν Υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας, κτίσμα γὰρ ἐστὶ καὶ ποίημα. "He ſubſiſts, not of or from the Father; but from nothing: "and he is not of the Father's Subſtance; for he is created and made." But the *Athanaſians* believed, the Son was *literally* generated from the Father's Subſtance.

Thirdly: As the *Arians* believe the Father and Son to be of a different Subſtance; they believed them alſo to be diſtinct Beings, ſeparately exiſting; δύο πράγματα· in which they agree'd with ſome of the Orthodox Fathers, as *Origen*, *Gregory Nyſſen*, *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, *Maximus* the Martyr, *Damaſcen*, *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, *Alexander* of *Alexandria*, &c.: and differed from others, who believed him to be ἐκ πατρὸς, of or from the Father's Subſtance; as the Leaves are from the Tree: but not divided from it, as the *Athanaſians*.

Fourthly: They believed, that Chriſt was the only begotten Son of God; becauſe he only was created by the *immediate* act and power of God *himſelf*, ἀμεσοποίητον· and that all other Beings, the Holy Ghoſt not excepted, were created *by Chriſt*: in which they agree'd with *Origen* and *Euſebius*, men of as great character as any in the Chriſtian Church. And therefore they called him a Creature; but not like other Creatures.

Fifthly: They believed, that the Son was generated or created before all Ages; and was a real Perſon, when ſpoken of, *Prov.* viii. 22. and that his Generation was over, as ſoon as he exiſted. Whereas ſome of the Orthodox believed him to be only an *Attribute*, when there ſpoken of; and that he was afterwards generated into *a Son*: and ſome of them believed him eternally generating, as Light from the Sun.

Sixthly: They believed the *divine* Being, who deſcended from Heaven and was born of the Virgin *Mary*, was the only intelligent Spirit that animated the *Body* of Chriſt; and that this *divine* Being ſuffered: but the Orthodox believed; that the *divine* Being, that deſcended from Heaven and animated the Body of Chriſt, was incapable of ſuffering: and that it was only the *human* Nature, or *Soul* of Chriſt, that ſuffered; *i. e.* a mere *Man*.

Seventhly: As the *Arians* believed Chriſt to be the Son of the only true God, and not the only true God and Father of that Son; it was very conſiſtent with their Belief to ſay, Οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς ὁ Χριστὸς· "He is not "the true God."—But if it be imagined, that by this expreſſion they mean'd to deny, that Chriſt was truely God the Son: the expreſs words of *Eunomius* prove the contrary; and *Arius* himſelf explanes his meaning ſufficiently

by what follows: Οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀλλὰ μέτοχος καὶ αὐτὸς ἐθεοποιήθη. i. e. "He is not the true (self-existent and un-originate) God; "but receives his Divinity by Communication:" which was the opinion of *Origen*, *Eusebius*, and *Lactantius*.

As all these notions, most of them mentioned by Dr. *Cave*, follow directly from the first general principle and foundation, which *Eunomius* has so much laboured to establish; it may easily be judged, whether either He or *Arius* have in any particular endeavoured to explane-away or soften their opinions; more than is consistent with that fundamental principle. And this will be a proper Criterion to judge by, whether Bishop *Bull* and Dr. *Cave* had any right to accuse them upon that account. Bishop *Bull* says; "If the *Arians* were asked, whether the Son was begotten of the Fa-"ther himself; they allowed it: meaning, the Son was so from God; as all "Creatures are: *i. e.* from Him they had the Beginning of their Existence.— "If it were asked, whether the Son of God was God; they confessed it: "nay, more, that he was *true God*. But, in what sense? Why, because he is "*made* true God. And when accused of calling the Son a Creature, "they denied it with disdain; with this reserve, that he was not a Crea-"ture like the other Creatures: which were created by the Word; and "not immediately by God, as the *Logos* was." *Bulli* Op. p. 34. These answers are looked upon by the Bishop, as crafty and prevaricating; but in Truth they contain the real Opinions of the *Arians*, fairly and honestly given: though Bishop *Bull* uses such severe language about it, calling it *in pervertendis ac detorquendis sacrorum Oraculorum verbis, impia atque abominanda vafrities.* But strength of argument does not lie in hard words: The Bishop's adversaries think, they see as much prevarication on the other side of the question; *viz.* in defending the Immutability of a Being, who was *once* in the form of *God*, and *afterwards* in the form of a *Servant*; now in the highest *Glory*, and at another time suffering *Pain* and *Death*: or the Impassibility of a God, that suffered and died; or the Infinity of a God, confined in a human Body; *&c.*

Dr. *Cave* can say severe things in as big words, and with as little proof, as Bishop *Bull*. He tells us; *Quanquam* tanta *verborum* monstra *& propositionum* portenta, fucatis *&* speciosis *explicationibus, homo* versatilis *ingenii, pro re nata emollire seu potius tegere soleret; summa tamen errorum semper huc redit: filium & tempore & natura & dignitate patre esse inferiorem, de non extantibus factum, & plane Creaturam; licet excellentiore creaturarum ordine collocatam. (Hist. Lit.)* He concludes, that he believed the Son to be inferior to the Father, in Time, Nature, and Dignity; made of a Substance not before existing, and planely a Creature, though of a more excellent order than others.

But these notions were not the *Inventions* of *Arius*. They were held by men of the best characters, that lived before him: In short, the most learned

learned of the Ancients talked ſo much in the *Arian* ſtyle; that they are accuſed of *Arianiſm*. *Jackſon*, 331. And this the Adverſaries of the *Arians* confeſs; when they ſometimes accuſe *Origen*, ſometimes *Dionyſius Alex.*: and even *Philo Judæus*, as being the fountain of *Arianiſm*. And this was the plea, that both *Arius* and *Eunomius* made in their Defenſe. "Theſe things, ſays *Eunomius*, we think as we have learned them from "holy Men; and ſo thinking we believe: paſſing by nothing that we "have learned through ſhame, neither through audacity or perverſe-"neſs adding-to or altering any thing. *Bib. Gr.* Vol. viii. p. 261." And *Arius* begins his Epiſtle to Biſhop *Alexander* in this manner; *Fides illa, quam & a Majoribus accepimus & a Te didicimus, ejuſmodi eſt.* Wherein he gives an account of his Faith; and in which he has theſe remarkable words—*Quare etiam ante filium ſuum Chriſtum eſt* [*Deus*]; *ſicut a Te didicimus, cum id in media eccleſiâ prædicares.* Epiph. Hær. 69. § 7. 8. Accordingly, *Zonaras* ſays; (Tom. iii. Annal.) Arius *Dei Filium & Verbum* creaturam *dicere non dubitavit; & alterius eſſe Naturæ, nec Patri cœternum. Nec ipſe tamen auctor hujus ſectæ exſtitit; ſed* Origenes. (Sand. *Hiſt. Ecc.* 231.) And *Petavius* ſays; It was the great advantage of *Arius*, that many of the Fathers of the Church had ſpoken in ſuch kind of terms before him. p. 285. *ad Hær.* 69. *Origen* held, that the Son was creäted by the Father: and *Epiphanius* accuſes him of calling him γενητὸν Θεόν. (*Vales. apud Theod.* l. 2. c. 6. *Burnet's* Animad. on Mr. *Hill*, p. [illegible] And, in his anſwer to *Celſus*, he ſays; we call the Son a ſecond God. l. 5. p. 258.) and adds; the firſt God or Father worketh not; no, nor properly ſpeaking, doth the Son or ſecond God. *ibid.* lib. 6. p. 318. — *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* ſays of him, Ποίημα καὶ γενητὸν εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ μηδὲ ὁμοφυὲς ἰδίῳ, ἀλλὰ ξένον καὶ ἰδίαν εἶναι τοῦ πατρὸς ὥσπερ ἐστὶν ὁ γεωργὸς πρὸς τὴν ἄμπελον, καὶ ὡς ὁ ναυπηγὸς πρὸς τὸ σκάφος· καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γενέσθαι. *Daillé* p. 80. 83. *Dionyſ. Alex.* apud *Athan.* Ep. de fide *Dionyſ. Alex.* Vide & *Baſil.* Ep. 51. tom. 2. p. 808. *Facturam & factum eſſe filium Dei; nec natura proprium, ſed (hoſpitem vel peregrinum) ſecundum ſubſtantiam eſſe Patris; ſicut agricola ad vineam, & navium fabricator ad ſcaphum: etenim tanquam factum exiſtens non erat antequam fieret.* (Sandii 194.)

He alſo calls the Father and Son δύο πράγματα; as *Origen* had done: and maintained a difference between the Father and Son, not only of *Hypoſtaſis* but of οὐσία or a difference καὶ οὐσίαν. See *Jackſon*, p. 450. *Juſtin Martyr* in like manner declares them to be two in *number*; and ſays, no man ever ſaw the Father; but only hear'd his Son and his Angel, who is alſo God by the will of the Father: and that the God, who appeared to the Patriarchs, was the Son, and not the Father; for as much as the Father is not capable of local motion, nor can properly be ſaid to aſcend or deſcend: which words, as Mr. *Daillé* obſerves, cannot be very well explained; without allowing a difference of Nature in the Father and Son:

which

which were to establish *Arianism*. (*Daillé*) p. 79. He also calls the Son Θεὸν ὑπηρέτην τῦ ποιητῦ τῶν ὅλων Θεῦ the God who is Servant to the God of the Universe. *Jackson*, 332. *Tertullian* says, there was a time, when the Son was not: and numbers of them agree'd in the notion, that the Son was begotten *in tempore*, a little before the beginning of the world: and consequently, as Mr. *Jurieu* has observed, that the Trinity commenced but a little before the beginning of the World.

All these were to the full as heretical as *Arius*; and yet they are spoken of with respect, and their Heresies are overlook'd, or soften'd into Orthodoxy: (as the words of *Origen* are by *Dens*, p. 25; and those of *Dionysius*, by *Athanasius* and *Daillé*, 83.) [illegible], the same words of *Arius* are highthen'd, with all the appearance of rage and malice, into Blasphemy and Idolatry. "And if any one shall wonder at this," says *Sandius*, "that the "*Antenicene* Fathers preached and published the same doctrine as *Arius*; let "his wonder cease, when he observes, that those doctrines were never declared "to be heretical, [illegible], nor condemned in any Coun- > before the Council of Nice there
"cil: nay, that there was no Heretic [he means, none that was looked "upon as a Heretic] before *Arius*, who held the same doctrines as he "did. For the Anathema to these doctrines was first of all denounced "against *Arius* by the *Nicene* Council, and afterwards by those of *Macedon* > against Macedonius
"and *Constantinople*: after which, it was no longer allowed to preach or "publish such doctrines." *Sandii* Nuc. p. 230. and it was even a capital crime, to keep an *Arian* book.

Now when I consider these things, I can hardly imagine it possible, that so much rancour and ill-will, both among the ancients and moderns, should arise merely from a zele for truth and the honour of God: and not rather from some other principles which the *Arians* maintained, more directly opposed to the authority and power of the Ecclesiastics.

And the following observations will shew such a suspicion to be probable.—

As, First: the *Arians* are accused by *Chrysostom*, of making the twelv'th Canon of the Council of *Antioch*, which orders, that a Bishop who is deposed shall appeal to a Synod, and not be restored, except by a greater number of Bishops than had deposed him. This Canon was directly against the restoration of *Chrysostom*; and so he palms it upon the *Arians*: and the *Romish* Church condemns it, because it takes away the pretended apostolical custom of appealing to *Rome*. *See Labb.* 595. *Bin.* p. 417. Col. 2. *Comber*, p. 105.

Secondly: The *Arians* are likewise accused of the *Scripturarian* Heresy; or taking the holy Scripture for their only guide in Controversy. "These "*Scripturarians*," says *Prateolus*, "*Satan* lead away into error, as he did "formerly the *Arians*; whilst they admitted only the holy Scripture, re- "jecting the learned and holy Interpreters; against Whom the Catholics op- "pose Tradition." We see then, how the *Arians* came to be such monstres;

in the eyes of the *Papists*: and at the Reformation, these subjects were not fully considered.

3. Add to these notions, what we are told by *Epiphanius* and *Austin*, that *Arius* was enrolled in the number of Heretics, for denying the Lawfulness of Episcopacy. (*Nelson's Festiv.* &c. p. 543; *Epiphan.* Haer. 75; *August.* de Haer. 53:) and we shall no longer wonder at his being looked upon by *Jerom* as an impudent devil; *Daemonium meridianum*[a]; (*Ang.* Apol. a con. *Ruffin. Daillé*, &c.) and treated by the Fathers and their Successors with so much rage: and that the severity of the Christians against one another began with the banishment of Him and his followers.

It is a very common assertion, that *Arius* denied the *Eternity* and *Divinity* of the Son of God; but it never yet appeared to Me, upon good authority: for First, he never denied the *Eternity* of the Son, in any other sense, than that in which it is denied by the Orthodox, and signifies unoriginate, and unbegotten; that is, self-existent. This accusation is drawn, by way of inference, (in contradiction to the express words of the *Arians* in their Creeds) from his asserting, with regard to the *Logos*, ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν. there was, when he was not: which is generally translated, there was a *Time*, when he was not; but there is no such word as *Time*, in the *Greek*; nor in *Hilary's* translation: and *Arius* believed, that the *Logos* existed "before all *Ages*;" (as Archbishop *Tenison*[b] confesses;) and consequently, before all *Times*: and *Arius* declares, in his Letter to Bishop *Alexander*; (*Epiph.* Haer. 69, § 7, 8) *ante tempora & ante secula creatum*: and again, *sine tempore & ante omnia genitus solus a solo Deo productus est*. And if so, *Arius* might believe him to be eternal, though created; according to the philosophy of those ages. And no doubt it was upon this account, that he designedly avoided to use the word *Time*; and made use of the Circumlocution, ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν. see Note VI. For it was the opinion of the *Platonists*; that the Generation of the *Word*, or Son of God, "was not from "any temporal beginning; there being yet no such thing as *Time*: nor, "when *Time* was afterwards made, did it any way affect him; for Mind "[Νοῦς] is always timeless, and alone eternal[c]." And accordingly, it appears by the Letters of *Eusebius*, written to Bishop *Alexander*, that he was perfuaded, *Arius* and his Sect confessed the *Word* was Eternal; and he thought it a false imputation, that he taught the contrary[d].

A second peculiarity of *Arius's* doctrine, from whence it was inferred,

[a] 'Tis probable, when *Jerom* calls *Arius* an impudent Devil, *Daemonium meridianum*, he refers to *Psalm* xci. 6; where the words in the *English*, *Destruction which wasteth at noon-day*, are translated in the LXX; ἀπὸ δαιμονίου μεσημβρίας "the Daemon at noon-day." The Pestilence, that walketh in Darkness; is opposed to the Destruction or Daemon, that destroyeth at Noon-day: And therefore does not signify *impudent Devil*; but refers to the destruction caused by Demons, through intense Heats, Plagues, &c. &c. See *Sykes* on *Daemoniacs*.

[b] *Tenison* on Idolatry. [c] *Porphyry* cited by *Cyril*, contr. *Jul.* lib. i. p. 32. *Cudworth*, 573. [d] *Dupin*, tom. ii. p. 2.

thas

that he denied the Eternity of the Son, was this; that he was not, before he was begotten into a Son; πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν. But then they believed him to be begotten from Eternity, and therefore to be eternal, according to the Philosophy of the *Platonists*, which then prevailed, concerning their inferior Gods; that they were creäted, and yet were ἀίδιοι and ἀθάνατοι. For though the Pagan Theists say, "the word γενητὸν, strictly and properly "taken, is τὸ ἐν μέρει χρόνου τὸ μὴ εἶναι πάλαι λαβόν" (that which in "respect of *Time* passed out of Non-existence into Being); yet in a larger "sense it may be taken also for τὸ ὁπωσοῦν ἀπ' ἄλλου ὑφεστάναι· that which "is any way dependent on a Cause."[a] However, this opinion of the *Arians*, that Christ was not before he was begotten, πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, was condemned by the *Athanasians*: who asserted, that the second *Hypostasis* had an Existence, before he was begotten into a Son; τὸν ἀεὶ προόντα, ὑπὲρ γεννηθέντα υἱόν. And it is said, that *Eusebius* was one that condemned this opinion of *Arius*, and gives us this reason for it; *because all men believe, he* [Christ] *was the Son of God, before his Generation according to the Flesh*[b]. But there is reason to believe, that this was never said by *Eusebius*, and is an interpolation. See *Bulli* Op. 226. If he did say it, it was a paltry Evasion: for the *Arians* never denied his Existence, before his Generation according to the Flesh, nor did *Eusebius* believe, they did so: but on the contrary they declared, that the *Word* existed before all ages: and that his divine Generation before all ages was the beginning of his Existence. And they founded their argument upon the same text, as the *Orthodox*, which *Eunomius* the *Arian* has twice quoted: *Prov.* viii. 22. which in the LXX runs thus, Κύριος ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ, πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος θεμελίωσέ με, &c. Both parties believed the *Wisdom* here spoken of to be the Son of God: in which, it is probable, they were both mistaken, and the word ought to be explained in a figurative sense, as it is by Bishop *Patrick*.——However, upon this Text, which is called the *Achilles* of the *Arians*; the *Arians* argued, that the Son was *creäted* before all ages; *i. e.* from Eternity: and the *Orthodox* argued, on the other side, that he existed *in the Father* from Eternity, as the *Attribute of Wisdom*; according to the doctrine of the *Platonists*: and was afterwards begotten into a Son.

The *Arians* believed, that the *Word* of God never existed otherwise than as a real Person, or conscious Substance; and that his Generation or Creation was the beginning of his Existence; and that he existed before all worlds, and consequently was *eternal*; in the same sense in which the *Orthodox* believed the Generation of the Son to be eternal.

The truth is, that the *Orthodox* had two senses to the word *Eternal*, which they used, as best suited their convenience. Sometimes they used it in an absolute sense; as when they speak of *eternal Existence*, as an Attribute

[a] *Simplic.* in *Aristot.* Phys. fol. 265; *Cudworth*, 253, 254. [b] *Jackson's* Reply to Dr. *Waterland*, p. 124; *Athan. de Syn. Arim. & Seleu.* & *Hilar.* de Trin.

tribute of God: and ſometimes in a more lax ſenſe; as when they ſpeak of the *eternal Generation* of the Son of God. But finding the advantage the *Arians* made of this laſt, "moſt of thoſe who have diſputed with the *Arians*, "after the Council of *Nice*, have abandoned the ſyſtem of the Ancients, con- "cerning the two Productions; as *Alexander* of *Alexandria* had abandoned it. "This great man being, it ſeems, more uſed to this controverſy, had found "that this ſecond Production gave mighty advantages to the *Arians*[g];" for if the Generation was eternal, and Chriſt exiſted before it; then a *created* Being might alſo be *eternal*. The Council of *Antioch* therefore, ſome years after that of *Nice*, anathematiſed all thoſe that aſſerted, "that there was "an Age, or a Moment, before the Generation of the Word:" which is directly contrary to what I have juſt quoted, as the Tenet of *Conſtantine* and *Athanaſius*. So that thoſe Orthodox Chriſtians were under the ſame Anathema, with regard to the eternal *Generation* of the Son; which they had beſtowed upon the *Arians*, with regard to his eternal *Exiſtence*. For nothing could be done in thoſe days, without an Anathema: every Miſtake was magnified into a Hereſy; and every Hereſy was to be anathematiſed.

Secondly: As to the charge againſt *Arius*, that he did not believe the Divinity of Chriſt; it by no means appears to be true: for it was upon this very account; *viz.* becauſe he worſhipped the Son of God, ſuppoſing him at the ſame time to be a God created before all ages; that his adverſaries accuſed him of Idolatry. Now, if he was idolatrous in believing Chriſt to be a created God; it is impoſſible he ſhould at the ſame time be guilty of denying his Divinity.

Again, *Theodoret* tells us; it was the opinion of *Arius* and *Eunomius*, that Chriſt took a Body; but the Godhead or Divinity performed the Office of a Soul: Θεότητα δὲ ψυχῆς ἐνηλλάχθαι τὴν χρείαν. *Athanaſius* ſays; *Arius* taught, that Chriſt had the Fleſh as a Covering to the Divinity or Godhead; Ἀρεῖος δὲ σάρκα μόνον φησὶς ἀποκρυφὴν τῆς Θεότητος ὁμολογεῖ· ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐνοῦσθαι ἐν ἡμῖν ἄνθρωπον, τοῦτ' ἐστι τῆς ψυχῆς, τὸν Λόγον ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ λέγει γεγονέναι[h]. Now, if *Arius* believed the Divinity to be incarnate in Chriſt, and worſhipped Chriſt as being God; How can it be ſaid, that he denied his Divinity? The true reaſon, why the *Orthodox* accuſe the *Arians* of this, is; becauſe the *Arians* ſuppoſed the *Word* to be *created*: upon which the *Orthodox* argued; that, if the *Arians* believed him to be *created*, they did not believe him to be *God*: whereas the *Arians* believed him to be both. Moreover, the *Arians* denied the Word to be ὁμοούσιον, conſubſtantial with the Father; thinking it an abſurd and blaſphemous opinion: and this alſo, the *Nicene* Fathers looked upon to be a denial of his *Divinity*; for they argued, That whatever is conſubſtantial with the Father, is *God*; and whatever is non-conſubſtantial with the Father, is not *God*.

[g] *Animadverſions*, p. 44. [h] *Dupin*, tom. ii. p. 322. [i] *Theod.* lib. v. con. Hær. c. 11. [k] *Athan.* de *Ad. Chriſt.* cum Apol. l. ii. n. 3. p. 942; and Note XXVIII.

But

But both these propositions are denied by several of the *Orthodox*, as well as the *Arians*. For as to the first; *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Lactantius*, and other antient Christian writers, thought even Angels, and the Souls of Men, to be consubstantial with, or generated from, the divine Substance; but they did not therefore believe them to be *God*[1]. And the second Proposition, That whatever was not consubstantial with the Father was not *God*; must have been denied by all those, that believed the Son could receive his Divinity by the Communication of it; as *Origen*, *Lactantius*, &c. And farther, if the word *Consubstantial* be understood to mean, of the same *numerical* Substance; according to the notion fixed at the Council of *Lateran*; then this Proposition must also have been denied by *Greg. Nyssen*, *Cyril*, and all the Orthodox, who believed the Trinity to be three Individuals separately existing.

X. p. 23. *Favourers of the* Arians. —— Mr. *Richard Baxter* calls the Opinion of *Arius*, a *Mistake*: and says; "the *Samosatenians*, and *Photinians*, and our late *Socinians*, are far more perniciously heretical, than *Arius*." Church History, 48.

The ever-memorable *John Hales*, of *Eton*, considers it in the same light; not as a *Heresy*, but a *Mistake*. He allows *Manichæism*, *Valentinianism*, *Marcionism*, and *Mohammedism*, to be truly and properly Heresies; for, says he, we know they received them not; but minted them themselves: and so knew, that they taught a Lie. But can any man vouch, that *Arius*, and *Nestorius*, and Others, that taught erroneously concerning the Trinity, or the Person of our Saviour, did maliciously invent what they taught; and did not rather fall into it by Error and Mistake? *Hales's* Tracts, p. 182. See the *Arian* Creed, Note IX.

Erasmus, the restorer of Learning, has given occasion both to his Friends and Enemies to think him an *Arian*. He saith, *Phil.* ii. 6. was the principal Argument of the Fathers against the *Arians*; but that, to say truth, it proves nothing against them: he notes, on *Eph.* v. 5. that the word *God*, when used absolutely, always signifies the Father: and he denies that the *Arians* were Heretics, in the *Scholia* to the third tome of St. *Jerom's* Epistles; and, in an Epistle to *Bilibaldus Pirkheimerus*, says; I could be of the *Arian* Perswasion, if *the Church* approved of it. [And *Bellarmine* says of him; that he could not more openly espouse the *Arian* Cause, than he has done; in his Notes on the Fathers, and the principal Texts of Scripture. Pref. ad Lib. v. de *Christo*; Unit. Tracts, tom. v. p. 3.]

Episcopius says, that three equal *Persons* in the Godhead make three *Gods*; and denies, that the Lord *Jesus* is the Son of God by *substantial Generation*: *i. e.* by Generation from the Father's Substance or Essence.

Sandius undertakes to prove, in his Ecclesiastical History; that all Anti-

[1] *Jackson*, p. 285. *Cudworth*, 535.

quity

quity was *Arians* and *Eunomians* for the *Anomœan* Fathers to have been of that opinion; upon which *Sandius* concludes, that he was of the same opinion *himself*. *Bulli Def. Fid. Nic.* Proœm. p. 45. *Pearson.* de Trin. l. i. c. 5. §. 7. & cap. 8. § 22. *Sandii Eccles. Hist.* l. i. 196. Edin. *Petr.* And *Dupin* declares, that he is not able to clear the apostolical Constitutions from *Arianism*, without doing them violence. p. 33.

Mr. *Chillingworth*, in answer to a Letter from a Friend, who desired to know, what judgement might be made of *Arianism* from the Rule of Antiquity, writes as follows: "I was mistaken, in directing you to *Eusebius*, for the "matter you wot of. You shall find it in a witness much further from "exception herein than *Eusebius*, even *Athanasius* himself, the greatest Ad- "versary of that Doctrine, and *Hilary*, who was his Second." See the first, in Ep. de Syn. *Arim.* & *Seleuc.* p. 917. D. tom. i. Edit. *Par.* 1627. See the second, de Synod. fol. 97. "In the first you shall find, the Eighty Fa- "thers, who condemned *Sabellianism*, affirmed expressly—that the Son is not "of the same Essence of the Father: which is to contradict formally the "Council of *Nice*, which decreed the Son consubstantial to the Father. In the "second you shall find these words, to the same purpose:—*Offoginta Episcopi alium restituunt* τὸ Homœusion. See also, if you please, *Just. con. Tryph.* p. 283, 366, 367; *Tertull.* against *Prax.* cap. ix; *Novat. de Trin. in fine*, who is joined with *Tertull. Athanas. Ep. de fide div. Alex.* tom. i. p. 581. *Basil.* tom. ii. p. 802, 803, Ed. *Par.* 1618. See St. *Hieromes Apol. 2. contr. Ruff.* tom. ii. p. 529. *Par.* 1579. See *Petav.* upon *Epiph.* his *Panar. ad Hæres.* 69. *quæ est* Arii, 385. And consider well how he "clears *Lucian* the Martyr from *Arianism*; and what he there confesses of "all the ancient Fathers.

"If you could understand *French*, I would refer you to *Perron*, p. 635 "of his Reply to King *James*; where you shall find these words:——If a "man should demand of an *Arian*, if he would submit to the judgement "of the Church of the ages precedent to that of *Constantine*; he would "make no difficulty of it: but would himself press, that the controversy "might be decided by that little which remains to us of the Authors of "that time. For an *Arian* would find in *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and others "which remain of those ages, that the Son is the Instrument of the Father; "that the Father commanded the Son, in the works of Creation; that the "Father and the Son are *aliud* et *aliud*: which things he that should now "hold, now when the language of the Church is more examined, would "be esteemed a very *Arian*.

"If you read *Bellarmine* touching this matter; you shall find, that he "is troubled exceedingly to find any tolerable glosses for the speeches of the "Fathers before the Council of *Nice*, which are against him: and yet he "conciles the strongest of them; and to counterpoise them, cites Authors "that have indeed ancient *Names*; but such as he himself has stigmatised "for spurious or doubtful, in his book *de Script. Eccles.*

Were

" Were I at leisure, and had a little longer time, I could refer you to " some, that acknowledge *Origen*'s judgement to be also against them in " this matter. And *Fisher*, in his Answer to Dr. *White*'s Nine Questions, " has a place almost parallel to the above-cited out of *Perron*.

" In a word, whosoever shall freely and impartially consider of this thing; " and how, on the other side, the ancient Fathers' weapons against the " *Arians* remain a manner only places of Scripture; (and those now for the " most part discarded, as impertinent and unconcluding;) and how in the " Argument drawn from the authority of the ancient Fathers, they are al- " most always Defendents, and scarce ever Opponents; he shall not choose " but confess, or at least be very inclinable to believe; that the Doctrine of " *Arius* is either a Truth, or at least no damnable Heresy." See the Life of Mr. *Chillingworth*, by *Des Maizeaux*, p. 51; Essay on Spirit, p. 116. See *Cudworth*, Int. Syst. l. 1. c. iv. p. 595.

Bishop *Bull*, speaking of the sentiments of *Origen* upon the Trinity, says; " I conclude thus with myself, that *Origen*, who hath been so severely cen- " sured by Divines both ancient and modern, was really Catholic in the ar- " ticle of the sacred Trinity: although in the manner of explaning that Ar- " ticle, he sometimes speaks otherwise than the Catholics do; which is no " more than almost all the Fathers did, who lived before the Council of " *Nice*." *Bulli* Def. Fid. *Nic.* Sect. 11, c. 9. § 22. Essay on Spirit, p. 120.

XI. p. 24. Mr. *Daillé*, towards the end of the third Chapter of his treatise of the right use of the Fathers, says of them; " Let the reader now judge, whe- " ther or no these writings having come down through so many ages, " and passed through so many hands, which are either known to have " been notoriously guilty of forgery, or at least strongly suspected of it; " the Truth in the mean time having made on its part very weak resistence " against these impostures; it be not a very hard matter to discover, among " the infinite number of books that are now extant, and go under the names " of the Fathers; which are those that truly belong to them, and which " again are those that are falsely imposed upon them."

And in another place, he says; " What makes the difficulty to find the " Truth still greater; those writings of the Fathers, which are legitimate, have " been in many places corrupted, by Time, Ignorance, Fraud, both pious and " malicious; both in former and later ages:" which he shews to have been done both by the Orthodox and Heretics. " They have made no scruple, " from the beginning of the sixth century, of cutting off from the most " sacred books they had, whatsoever was not agreable to the taste of the " Times." P. 49.

This is just what the *Jews* are accused of, with regard to their altering the *Targums*. *Allix* Jew. Ch. p. 95. These forgeries, he says, have in a manner borne down all good and true books; p. 32. Several of them he mentions; and tells us, *Anastasius Bibliothecarius* asserts, that the *Greeks* have corrupted

corrupted all the Councils, except the *first*: p. 52. In this accusation of forgery, he says, the *Greeks* and *Latins* did bandy stiffly against one another; each of them, as may be easily perceived, having more appearance of Reason and Truth in their accusation of their adversary, than in excusing and defending themselves.

"Nor have they contented themselves with *corrupting* only in this manner some certain books, out of which we might perhaps have been able "to discover, what the opinion and sense of the ancients have been: but "they have also wholely *abolished* a very great number." Of which he gives several examples; and concludes his fourth Chapter, by saying; that, the several causes he had before mentioned, have rendered the Writings and venerable Monuments of Antiquity so embroiled and perplexed; that it will be a hard matter for any man to make any clear and perfect Discovery of those things, which so many *Artists* have endeavoured to conceal from us.

XII. p. 25. Mr. *Chillingworth*, in the Preface to his Book, quotes *Hosius*, *Gerdonius Huntleius*, *Gretserus*, *Tannerus*, *Vega*, *Possevin*, *Wiekus*, *Petavius*; as so many witnesses to shew, that in the opinion of the *Papists* the modern Doctrine of the Trinity cannot be prove'd either from the Scripture, or the Ancients.

XIII. p. 27. It is certain, that most of the ancient Fathers, before the Council of *Nice*, have held a Generation of the Word *in tempore*; a little before the Creation of the World: the learned Dr. *Bull* has given us a long list of them. *Just. Mart.* ap. 2. p. 66 E. Dial. cum *Tryph.* p. 285. D. 358. 13. C. 359. B. *Athenag.* Legat. pro Christianis, p. 10. D. *Theoph.* ad *Autol.* p. 88. B. p. 100. B. *Tatian*, p. 145. B. *Clem. Alex.* Strom. v. p. 553. B. 591. B. Strom. vi. p. 644. A. Strom. vii. p. 700. C. *Tertul.* Apol. c. 21. p. 19. contra *Herm.* c. 3. c. 18. 20. 45. adv. *Prax.* c. 5. 7. 12. *Lact.* lib. 2. c. 8. p. 177. 178. l. 4. c. 6. p. 364. 365. 366. Bishop *Burnet's* Animadversions on Mr. *Hill's* Book, p. 44.

XIV. p. 27. This may be seen in *Just. Mart.* Dial. cum *Tryph.* p. 275 A. 283. B. and 357. B. C. in *Tertull.* against *Prax.* p. 648. in *Novat.* lib. de *Trin. Theoph.* l. 2. ad *Autol.* p. 100. *Tertull.* adv. *Jud.* c. 9. p. 194. adv. *Marcion.* l. 2. c. 27. p. 395. 396. Synod. *Antioch.* Concil. to. 1. Ed. *Lab.* to. 1. p. 845. D. *Euseb.* Hist. Eccles. l. 1. c. 2. — Quoted in Bishop *Burnet's* Animadversions on Mr. *Hill's* Book, p. 46.

XV. p. 28. *Quod ad cætera post consecuta Symbola, quæ in Conciliis Oecumenicis, ut vocantur, cusa fuerunt; ea, quia recentiora sunt, cum* his (namely, with the Creeds and Confessions of the three first Ages) *comparari non merentur. Et si, quod res est, dicendum est; ea ab Episcopis inter se magna cum emulatione jurgantibus*

jurgantibus & contendentibus ex fervore, ſi non furore partiumque ſtudio inſano ac maleferiato, præcipitata *potius videri debent quam a compoſitis animis profecta.* And he adds; (by which you may underſtand he mean'd the *Nicene* Creed particularly) *Quis enim neſcit, quam acres in Synodo* Nicæna *diſceptationes, quam præfracta jurgia inter Epiſcopos excitata fuerint?* Inſtit. Theol. lib. iv. c. 34; *Bulli* Op. Procem. p. 3.

XVI. p. 32. The Schole of *Alexandria* in *Egypt*, which was inſtituted by *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, renewed the old Academy or *Platonic* Philoſophy, and reformed it: The firſt famous *Platoniſt* of this Schole ſeems to have been *Potamon*, in the time of *Auguſtus* and *Tiberius Cæſar*. To him we may add *Ammonius*, the Maſter of *Plutarch*, (not the Maſter of *Origen*;) who lived in the Time of *Nero* and *Veſpaſian*. But it flouriſhed moſt under *Ammonius*, (the Maſter of *Origen* and *Plotinus*;) who borrowed his choiceſt Contemplations from the ſacred Scriptures, which he mix'd with his *Platonic* Philoſophiſings: and it is diſputed by *Euſebius* and *Porphyry*, whether he died a Pagan or a Chriſtian. He had great advantages; being bred-up in the ſame Schole with *Philo Judæus*; (ſuppoſed Author of the Book of the Wiſdom of *Solomon.*) Beſides which, there was in the town of *Alexandria* a famous Church, (ſettled by *Mark* the Evangeliſt;) and the Schole was continued by *Pantænus*, *Clemens Alexand. &c.* (*Gale's* Court of the *Gentiles*, p. 42. 253) and after him ſucceſſively by *Origen*, *Heraclas*, *Dionyſius*, *Athenadore*, *Malcyon*, and *Didymus*; who reached the Year 350: the which Doctors gave an admirable advance to the Church. The town was for this reputed the univerſal Schole of the Church; (*Morellius* of Church Diſc. lib. iii. c. 14. p. 260.) And the *Platonic* Philoſophy was in the higheſt authority among the Fathers. "For it was the common vogue, that it differed little "from *Moſes*; yea, *Cælius Rhodius* thinks, that *Plato* differs little from "Chriſt's Placits." *Gale* 225. *Hornius* Hiſt. Phil. l. iii. c. 14.

Origen, Scholar to *Ammonius*, though a profeſſed Chriſtian, yet followed his Maſter's ſteps; mixing the *Platonic* Philoſophy and the doctrines of the Goſpel together; hoping thereby to gain credit to the Chriſtian Religion: and, with *Clemens Alexandrinus* and others, made uſe of the *Platonic* and *Pythagoric* Philoſophy, as a medium to illuſtrate the grand myſteries of Faith: thereby to gain credit among thoſe *Platonic* Sophiſts. *Gale* 265. And F. *Simon* ſays; *Le melange de la philoſophie* Platonicienne *avec la Religion Chrétienne ne tendoit pas a la deſtruction de la Foy orthodoxe; mais a perſuader plus facilement aux* Grecs *le Chriſtianiſme.* Hiſt Crit. du Nov. Teſt. Tom. iii. This no doubt was the Intent; and it ſucceded as all ſuch methods have done. Among other *Platonic* Myſteries, that of the *Logos*, on which *Ammonius* and *Plotinus*, both Heads of the *Platonic* Schole, had commented, was taken and applied to the divine *Logos* explicated by St. *John*; which gave occaſion and foundation to many philoſophic diſputes and conteſts in the Schole and Church of *Alexandria*, as alſo to the Hereſy of *Arius*; as it

had done to that of *Samosatenus* before. Upon which *Morellius* the *French* Reformer says, the *Arian* heresy had its rise from the particular conferences of learned men in the city of *Alexandria*, (Diss. l. 2. c. 17. p. 87.) and *Justinian* acquaints us, that these philosophical notions about the *Platonic Logos* and *Trias*, which supposed a real difference in Nature between ὁ πατὴρ the Father, ὁ λογος the *Word*, and ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ κόσμου, the Soul of the World, gave occasion to the *Arian* heresy: (*Just.* on l. i. 1. and § 8.) and *Athanasius* himself allows, that the Word ἀγένητος, used in the dispute with the *Arians*, was taken from the *Platonists*, and finds fault with the *Arians*, for not using it as they (the *Platonists*) did. *Cudworth* 620. In short, there is not the least doubt, that the disputes upon the Trinity arose first in this Schole. "Philosophy and Curiosity, says *Morellius*, corrupted this Schole; and by consequence the Church:" and it is remarkable, that *Alexander*, *Arius*, and *Athanasius*, were all preferred in that Church.

According to this account of things, Mr. *Gale*, (vol. ii. p. 134) after mentioning some of *Origen*'s opinions about the Trinity, a hundred Years before the *Arian* Controversy, says; "These notions about the Trinity, he (*Origen*) imbibed from that *Platonic* philosophy, then taught in the Schole of *Alexandria* where he was instructed; which acknowledged a Trinity, namely, 1. ὁ πατὴρ the Father, whom they made ἀυτόθεον, the supreme Being. 2. ὁ νους the Mind, or ὁ λογος the Reason; whom they made inferior to the first: and 3. ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ κόσμου, the Mundane Spirit; which they made inferior to both the former; and hence *Origen* reduced his Trinity," &c.

And this is the more probable, if we consider what is said by *Dupin*, that, before his Time, the Word *Trinity* was not known in the Christian Church. For he tells us, that *Theophilus*, Bishop of *Antioch*, (contemporary with *Origen* and *Clement*) was the first who used the Word *Trinity* to signify three divine Persons; and he remarks, that he calls the third, *Wisdom* (*Sagesse*:) which is the more likely, as the Holy Ghost was not so soon acknowledged to be a *Hypostasis*, or real Substance; but only an Attribute: "It being more "than was acknowledged by the *Nicene* Fathers themselves; they not so "much as determining that the Holy Ghost was a *Hypostasis* (or *Person*,) "much less that he was *God*."

"The Council of *Nice*, says Mr. *Severain*, did not at all touch upon the "Divinity of the Holy Ghost." Far from it. The Holy Ghost was so little consider'd, at that time; that some Fathers of the Council would have made no difficulty to give the superiority or precedence to the Virgin *Mary*, in making Her the third Person of the Trinity. This we learn from *Eleusinus* and *Patricidas*. *Hollinger*, Hist. Orient. l. 2. p. 227. The Council of *Constantinople* did not dare to speak of it, but very indirectly: and in the time of *Basil*, they were shy of calling the Holy Ghost directly and formally *God*. It is worth while to hear what *Petavius* says upon the Subject. "The Catholic Church accommodating itself, through prudential Reasons, to human weakness, came not to the full profession of its Doctrines; but by little

little and little, and by certain degrees. For it had defined nothing in expreſs terms concerning the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, during the four firſt ages; or but a little before. Certainly *Gregory Naz.* excuſes the proceeding of St. *Baſil*, (Orat. 20. ep. 26.) who having right ſentiments of the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, yet for the good of the Church, would by no means call him *God* openly and formally; becauſe he was not ignorant, that there were many, otherwiſe good Catholics; who would be ſcandalized, that *theſe name* ſhould be given to the Holy Spirit: the uſage of it not being free and public among the Catholics, till after the ſecond general Council held in 381. *Petav.* de Trin. l. 2. c. vii. § 2. *Le Plat. dev.* 380. For the *Pneumatomachi*, who denied the Divinity of the Spirit, were yet the more powerful parts of the Church. *ib.* lib. 1. c. xiv. fol. 4 and 21. See alſo *Huetii* oper. l. 2. c. ii. q. 2. ſect. 10. *Unit. Tr.* tom. ii. p. 18.

And, what is a farther proof of this, the ancient Fathers, when they mention the objections of the Heathens upon this Subject, do not ſpeak of them as levelled againſt the notion of *three* Gods; but of *two* only: whereas, if the notion of the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt had then been faſhionable; they would have made the ſame objection, as is now made by the *Jews* and *Mohammedans*; not againſt *two* Gods, but againſt *three*. I ſhall only quote *Lactantius* Inſt. l. iv. c. xxix. *Fortaſſe quærat hic aliquis*, &c. Here ſome one may perhaps aſk; how, though Chriſtians profeſs to worſhip but *one* God, yet we ſeem to believe and hold *two* Gods; God the *Father*, and God the *Son*? This doctrine hath been a great ſtumbling-block to many; who confeſs, that in *other* points of the Chriſtian doctrine, we ſpeak what is probable and fit to be embraced; but in *this* they think we ſtumble, that we hold a *ſecond God*; and him alſo a mortal one; or one who could die.

Now if the diviſions of the Church were derived from the corruptions of that Schole; (as we are told by *Morellius*, *Juſtinian*, and others:) we ſhall probably underſtand the nature of them the better, by conſidering the ſyſtem of the *Platonic* Trinity; as we are told, that the Chriſtians rather endeavoured to accommodate the Scriptures to the *Platonic* Philoſophy; than by the help of the Scriptures to reform that Philoſophy: tampering betimes rather to bring Chriſtianity down to Philoſophy, than to make Philoſophy truckle under the truth and ſimplicity of the Scriptures: "which Phi-
"loſophy being only a ſophiſtication of Religion, proved an effectual door,
"to let-in all the errors and antichriſtian abominations, which have lien in
"the boſom of the Chriſtian Church ever ſince." (*Gale* 265.) What thoſe errors and abominations were, we ſhall beſt conjecture; by underſtanding the *Platonic* ſyſtem.

Porphyry, a Scholar of *Plotinus*, expounding the ſentiments of *Plato*, ſaith; that the Eſſence of God proceeds even to three *Hypoſtaſes*: but that the ſupreme God is τ'αγαθὸν, and that after him the ſecond is δημιουργὸς, the prime Opificer, or Creator; moreover that the third is ἡ ψυχὴ τὸ κόσμου, the mundane Soul, or univerſal Spirit: for the Divinity extended itſelf to the Soul

of the Universe. *Cyril. Alexan.* con. *Jul.* lib. i. p. 34. Edit. *Par.* 1638. *Gale* 383, &c.

These three *Hypostases* were called *Ouranus*, *Chronus* and *Zeus*; three Natures, three Principles, three Gods: and were supposed all together to be One Θεον, *Numen* or *Divinity*. And this word was applied to them all together, and to each of them singly; tho' the Father was properly called by them, as well as by the Christians, πηγὴ τῆς Θεότητος, the Fountain of the Godhead: and *Plato* calls him τῶν ἡγεμόνος καὶ αἰτίου παντὸς πατέρα the Father of the Prince and cause of all things; meaning to say, the Father of the second *Hypostasis*. *Cudworth* 385. 588. 407.

The three Hypostases of *Plato*'s Trinity are not only all eternal, but necessarily existent and absolutely undestroyable. For the first can no more exist without the second, which is αὐτοσοφία, the wisdom by which he himself is wise; (p. 575.) nor the first and second without the third; than original Light can exist without its splendor or coruscation, or effulgency: and consequently, they are not creatures. *Cudworth* 573. 577.

And when *Plato* asserts, that the Mind or second *Hypostasis* is γενὴς with the first; it is all one as if he had said, it is συγγενὴς, and ὁμοειδὴς and ὁμογενὴς with it: all which words are used by *Athanasius*, as synonymous with ὁμοούσιος (*coëssential* or *consubstantial.*) In this the *Nicene* Council agreed with the *Platonists*; and differed from *Arius*. And these three *Hypostases* are so closely joined together, as to be (*tantum non*) all-but the same; as the splendor is indivisibly joined with the Sun. They likewise seem to give to their three *Hypostases* such an ἐμπεριχώρησις *circumincession* and mutual *inbeing*, as the Christians do. *Cudworth* 578. 590.

They explane οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, as *Athanasius* and *Cyril* do, to differ only as a Species from an Individual (*Athan.* in his Treatise on the Syn. of *Arim.* and *Seleuc.* vol. i. 934. written towards the latter end of his life, says; ἡ δὲ ὑπόστασις οὐσία ἐστιν καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο σημαινόμενον. Bishop of *Clogher* on Spirit, p. 135.) So that they understood the Essence or Godhead, not to be *singular*, but *generical*; the οὐσία differing from the *Hypostasis*, as τὸ κοινὸν *general* from τὸ καθ' ἕκαστον *particular*: each person being supposed to have its *singular numerical* Essence. *Cudworth* 597. *Jackson* 446. *Ousia* means substance in general, and *Hypostasis* particular substance: as when we speak of fire in general, or a particular fire: but in both cases it signifies the substance of fire. Thus *Thomas* and *John* are of the same *Ousia*; but not of the same *Hypostasis*.

They declare the three Hypostases to be one Divinity or Godhead, because they have an essential and gradual subordination in them; the second being the image of the first, and the third the image of the first and second: whereas were they supposed to be perfectly coëqual, and to have no essential dependence upon one another, they could not be concluded by these *Platonists* to be any other than three coördinate Gods; having only a generical or specifical identity, and so no more one, than three men are one man: a thing,

thing, which the *Platonic* philoſophy is utterly abhorrent from; as that which is inconſiſtent with the perfect Monarchy of the Univerſe, and highly derogatory from the honour of the ſupreme God, and firſt cauſe (590.) Their intention in this ſubordination of the *Hypoſtaſes* of their Trinity being no other, than to exclude thereby a plurality of cöordinate and independent Gods; which they ſuppoſed an abſolute cöequality of them would infer. *Cudworth* 590. 595, 596.

Another reaſon given for this gradual ſubordination in the *Platonic* Trinity is mentioned by the learned Biſhop *Ruſt*, in his letter of Reſolution concerning *Origen* and his Opinions; re-publiſhed in the *Phœnix*. That if the ſecond and third *Hypoſtaſis* did receive from a neceſſity of Nature, equal perfection and plenitude in every reſpect from the firſt; then the ſecond and third *Hypoſtaſes* having the ſame neceſſity and plenitude of Nature, muſt unavoidably produce as many more; and ſo on *ad infinitum*: and the number of the divine *Hypoſtaſes* muſt be infinite; which is abſolutely contrary to the *Platonic* ſyſtem. For,

Plotinus writing againſt ſome *Gnoſtics* of his time, who would make more of theſe divine *Hypoſtaſes* than three; concludes from philoſophical principles, that there can be neither more nor fewer. For, as he argues, having placed firſt, the ſimple Good; we muſt ſet the Mind, or ſupreme Intellect, next after it; and then the univerſal Soul in the third place: for this is the right order, according to Nature; neither to make more intelligibles (or univerſal Principles) nor yet fewer than theſe three. For he that will contract the number, and make fewer of them; muſt of neceſſity ſuppoſe Mind and Soul to be the ſame, or elſe Mind and the firſt Good. But that theſe three are diverſe from one another, hath been demonſtrated by us: *&c.* *Cudworth*, 578.

Theſe are the chief Principles of the *Platoniſts* upon this ſubject; and Dr. *Cudworth* ſays, there is nothing in the genuine Doctrine of *Athanaſius*, but what a true and genuine *Platoniſt* would readily ſubſcribe: and that the *Platonic* ſyſtem, with all its Faults, is more agreable to the principles of Chriſtianity and Reaſon; than the Trinity of *Cyril*, *Gregory*, and ſeveral other reputed orthodox Fathers. *Cudworth*, 621.

Nevertheleſs, there are other Chriſtians; who accuſe the Chriſtian *Platoniſts*, and *Origen* in particular, and his followers; as "affecting to reduce the "Scriptures, and make them ſtoop to *Plato*'s Dogma and Schole." (*Huet. orig.* l. 2. c. ii. *Gale*, p. 266.) and charge them with almoſt all the great corruptions of Chriſtianity. But as he is accuſed by ſome, he is defended by others. So that after all our Examinations upon this ſubject among the Fathers, we are at a loſs to know in general; whether it was *Origen*, that made the Scriptures ſtoop to Philoſophy; or his adverſaries: and more particularly, what parts of the preſent ſyſtem are the genuine and original Doctrines of Chriſtianity; and what parts are taken from the *Platoniſts*: who believed a Trinity, long before Chriſtianity exiſted.

If

If we endeavour to trace the Belief of a Trinity as high as we can; we are not to imagine, that *Plato* was the inventer of this Trinity of *Hypoſtaſes*; it being much older than his time: tho' it does not appear, that it was ever before wrought into ſuch a philoſophical ſyſtem; as it was by Him and his followers. *Plotinus* ſays; it appears from *Plato*'s own Writings, that theſe doctrines are not new or of yeſterday; but have been very anciently delivered, tho' obſcurely: *Parmenides* before him having inſiſted on them, and the diſcourſes now extant being only explications of them. Now *Parmenides* was a *Pythagorean*; whence it is probable, that the doctrine of a divine Triad was one of the *Arcana* of that Schole; (*Cudworth*, 546.) and that the oriental maxim which *Pythagoras* brought with him into *Greece*, that God was ἓν καὶ πολλὰ, related to that Doctrine: for the Trinity of *Parmenides* was ἓν τὸ πᾶν, ἓν πάντα, ἓν καὶ πολλά. (*Gale*, 48.) And this is confirmed in that *Numenius* a *Pythagorean* entertained it as ſuch; and *Moderatus* affirms it to be a *Pythagoric Cabbala*; and *Jamblichus* ſays, there were three Gods praiſed by the *Pythagoreans*. But farther,

The *Pythagorean* philoſophy was derived from the *Orphic Cabbala*; as *Proclus* teſtifies. (See *Cudworth*, 305. 306.) For *Orpheus* introduced a *Trimorphic* God, a triform Deity; and *Amelius* tells us, that *Plato*'s three Kings were the ſame with the Trinity of *Orpheus*;—*Phanes*, *Ouranus*, and *Chronus*. But *Plato* nevertheleſs aſſerted one ſelf-exiſtent Deity and original of all things; and ſays, all things were made by one Deity, under theſe three ſeveral names; *Light*, *Counſil*, and *Life*.

Orpheus, *Pythagoras*, and *Plato* all travelling into *Egypt*, were there initiated in the *arcane* Theology of the *Egyptians*: whence it ſeems probable, that this was an *Egyptian* doctrine. *Athanaſius Kircherus* does not doubt it; and *Jamblichus* mentions the three *Hypoſtaſes* by the names of *Eikton*, *Emeph* (or *Cneph*) and *Ptha*. *Cudworth*, 353, 354.

Dr. *Cudworth* obſerves alſo ſome footſteps of a Trinity, in the *Mithraic* myſteries among the *Perſians*; derived from *Zoroaſter*: that the *Perſian Mithras* was called *triplaſios*, (threefold;) and the three *Hypoſtaſes* were *Oromaſdes*, *Mithras*, and *Arimanes*. And as *Arimanes* ſignifies ὁ Ἀιδης or *Pluto*; he obſerves, that *Pluto* was the third in the *Perſian*, as well as in *Homer*'s Trinity; and quotes from theſe Oracles Παντὶ γὰρ ἐν κόσμῳ λάμπει Τριὰς, ἧς Μονὰς ἄρχει which by the way is not a Trinity, but a Quaternity. He obſerves alſo a Trinity of Gods among the *Samothracians*, called by a *Hebrew* name *Cabirim*, or the mighty Gods: whence he ſuppoſes, it might be originally derived from the *Hebrews*; and ſays, the *Roman Capitoline* Trinity was from hence derived. 288, 289, 290, 547, 548.

But Sir *Iſ. Newton* ſays; when the myſteries of "*Ceres* were inſtituted at "*Eleuſis*, there were other myſteries inſtituted to her and her daughter and "her daughter's huſband in the iſland of *Samothrace*, by the *Phœnician* "names of *Dii Cabiri*; *Axieros*, *Axiokerſa*, and *Axiokerſes*: that is, the great "Gods *Ceres*, *Proſerpina*, and *Pluto*." Chronol. 157.

In

In like manner it may be obſerved; that a Trinity of Gods in the ſame Family was no uncommon thing. *Thaas* or *Cinyras* was worſhipped in *Egypt*, by the name of *Adonis* or *Baal Canaan*; and his wife *Calycopis*, the mother of *Adonis*, by the name of *Venus*; the *Dea Cypria* and *Dea Syria* of the ancients: and their ſon *Cinyris*, by the name of *Adon* or *Adonis*, the Lord: and in the *Capitoline* Trinity, *Jupiter*, and his wife *Juno*, and his daughter *Minerva*. *Cudworth*, 450. Alſo *Jupiter Ammon*, and his wife *Titæa*, and ſon *Bacchus* or *Oſiris*; and afterwards *Oſiris*, and his wife *Iſis*, and ſon *Orus*: *Newton*'s Chron. 224. So that no argument can be drawn either from the *Hebrew* or *Phœnician* word *Cabirim*, or from the number of *Hypoſtaſes* among the Philoſophers being a Trinity; that it was derived from the *Hebrews*. Lord *Morlay du Pleſſis Marly*, in the 6th chapter of the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion; the 5th and 6th Chapters of which I met with in a Pamphlet publiſhed by Mr. *Bellamy* in 1721: carries the origin of this Doctrine much higher. His words are theſe. Let us now ſee, what the *Devils* themſelves have been forced to acknowledge: who, either by the aſſiſtence of the ſacred Scriptures, or by having been once the happy inhabitants of the realms of Light above; have had ſome inſight into this important and myſterious Doctrine: and certainly it muſt be no ſmall ſatisfaction to obſerve, with what reluctance thoſe reſtleſs, haughty, and obdurate ſpirits have ſubmitted to the irreſiſtible charms of Truth. *Thulis*, an ancient proud monarch of *Egypt*, aſked *Serapis* their chief Dæmon; (and conjured him by all that was ſacred not to deceive him:) what Prince ever had been, or ſhould be greater than himſelf? To whom he anſwered;

Πρῶτος Θεὸς, μετ' ἐκεῖνον Λόγος, καὶ Πνεῦμα σὺν αὐτοῖς,
Πάντα δ' ἑνωμένα ταῦτα, καὶ εἰς ἓν ἰόντα τὸ πᾶν τό,
Οὗ κράτος ἀθάνατον πᾶσιν ἀνθ' ἁπάντων, ὠκυπόδων, βαδίζε-
Τὸν βίον· εἰ δ' ἄλλον τιν' ἐπεύχεαι οὗ πολὺ κρείσσων.

Primus Deus, deinde Verbum, & Spiritus cum his;
Omnia vero cognata illa, & in unum compacta,
Cujus poteſtas æterna: citis pedibus, mortalis, abi;
Vitam qui ignotam tranſegit te potior eſt multo.

It is thus tranſlated; I ſuppoſe, by Mr. *Bellamy*:

Three God-almighties fill Heaven's awful Throne:
The Father ſits ſupreme, next him his Son,
The Spirit laſt: and yet theſe Three are One.
With ſpeed, fond Queriſt, from theſe altars fly:
Too deep, too intricate this Myſtery,
For You to comprehend, or be reſolv'd by Me.

The

The noble Lord confirms this with another quotation from the oracle of *Apollo*. However, Mr. *Bellamy* seems here to have forgotten the *Athanasian* Creed; that there are not three Almighties, but one Almighty. What credit is to be given to the Devil, when he is upon his oath, and conjured by all that is sacred, I shall not examine; as the World is now too wise to believe a word of the Story.

Dr. *Cudworth* speaks of certain significations in the Old Testament of *Plurality* in the Deity, or of more than one *Hypostasis*; but in truth there are no such significations: but the Unity of God is asserted throughout the whole, as strongly as possible; being, as *Maimonides* says, *fundamentum fundamentorum*. The God *Jehovah*, the Word of *Jehovah*, and the Spirit of *Jehovah*, are indeed there spoken of; but they are spoken of as different Beings, except where the *Spirit* of God means the *Person* of God. There is not the least intimation in the Old Testament, that these three are one Substance, Essence or Nature; there is no Coëssentiality or Consubstantiality once hinted at. And tho' Mr. *Gale*, p. 48, calls the Pagan Trinity *dim, poor notices* of a Trinity, *weak, corrupt traditions*; it seems in truth to be much more clearly spoken of as a Trinity in Unity by the *Platonists*, and in the Heathen oracles, than any where in the *Jewish* Scriptures, or in any divine *Cabbala*, as pretended by *Proclus*, and favoured by Dr. *Cudworth*. For as to any *Cabbala* of authority, there is no such thing.

Dr. *Cudworth* says from *Proclus*, it cannot be conceived how such a Trinity of divine *Hypostases* should be discovered by human wit and reason; and therefore it must be from a divine *Cabbala*. But this is very fallacious; first, because, by this Argument, a false opinion of the Trinity may be proved to be from a divine *Cabbala*, as well as the true one: and therefore his *Consequence* is false. Besides, the Christians argue with great appearance of truth; when they tell us, the reveled Laws of God may be concluded to be divine; because they are agreable to those Truths, which he has written in our Breasts: but they must not argue at the same time, that others are divine; because they are apparently contrary to the Truths we find in our own breasts.—This is inconsistent.—But farther, the Premises in this argument are as false as the Conclusion. For the Doctrine of a Trinity is not at all inconceivable; but very easy to be accounted for more ways than one. As first,

It might arise from Natural Philosophy; which, as *Cicero* observes, was mixed with their Divinity, and formed their Religion. For as the World is naturally divided into Earth, Air, and Sea; the Government of it by three Persons seems to want no other foundation, to become a doctrine among the *Polytheists*; even while they were believed by the Unitarians to be the same Being. Accordingly, Dr. *Cudworth* says, "that *Jupiter*, *Neptune*, and *Pluto*, "were not three real distinct substantial beings, but only so many several "names for one supreme God, (according to the true and natural Theo-

"logy

"logy of the Pagans) is thus plainly declared by *Pauſanias* in his *Corinthiacs*; "where he expounds the meaning of a certain Statue of *Jupiter* with three "eyes, called the Country *Jupiter* of the *Trojans*; *viz.* to ſignify that it is "the ſame God which ruleth in three ſeveral parts of the World; the Hea-"ven, the Sea, and the Earth." (*Cudworth*, p. 492. and 450.) And thus the triple *Hecate* is conſidered as one Being, acting under different characters; being *Luna* in the Heaven, *Diana* on Earth, and *Proſerpina* in Hell." And hence might ariſe the ſuperſtitious regard to the number *Three*, from whence they feigned *Three* Furies, *Three* infernal Judges, *Three* Fates, *Three* Graces, *Three* Syrens, *Three* Gorgons, *Three* Cyclopes; and uſed it in conjuration, Τρὶς εἰς ἐμὸν ἔπτυσα κόλπον.

But, beſides their Natural Philoſophy, we may conſider their Metaphyſics. Mr. *Sowerain* obſerves, that *Thyſius*, in his notes on *Lactantius*, has penetrated to the firſt ſource of this Philoſophy which conſiſts in a Trinity of Principles, from an other reaſon, God, ſays he, created the World, and adorned it with a thouſand Wonders, that the Spirit of Man contemplating ſo ſurprizing a Work, may admire the *Wiſdom*, the *Goodneſs*, and the *Power* of the great Opificer. *Le Plat. dev.* p. 55. And theſe Attributes and Qualities, being conſidered as ſo many Subſtances, hence aroſe ſo many Trinities in Unity. And Dr. *Cudworth* himſelf is of the ſame opinion, when he ſays, the three *Hypoſtaſes* of the *Platoniſts* do not ſeem to be any thing elſe than infinite *Goodneſs*, infinite *Wiſdom*, and infinite *Power* and *Love*. *Cudworth*, 590; and again, "We have propoſed the three principal [Properties, or] Attributes of the Deity, ſays he; the firſt whereof is infinite "Goodneſs, with Fecundity; the ſecond, infinite Knowledge and Wiſdom; "and the laſt, infinite, active, and perceptive Power. From which three "divine Attributes, the *Pythagoreans* and *Platoniſts* ſeem to have framed "their Trinity of *Archical Hypoſtaſes*; ſuch as have the nature of Principles "in the Univerſe, *&c.* p. 206." And this foundation being once laid, other Trinities were alſo invented, which were uſed in their metaphyſical diſquiſitions. Thus, as I obſerved, *Orpheus* ſuppoſes, all things were made by God, under three names, *Light*, *Counſil*, and *Life*: *Amelius* conſiders the Trinity, as he that *is*, he that *has*, and he that *beholds*: 306. and *Proclus Lycius* mentions three Types of God, Bounty, Immutability, and Unity. (*Gale*, 258.) And *Voſſius* ſays of him, that he endeavoured to reduce all things to Trinities, from *Plato*'s Republic. *Lib.* ii. How like is this to the three *modal* diſtinctions, by which Divines do uſually explane the Trinity, *viz.* Life, Underſtanding, and Will; and St. *Auſtine*'s Trinity of Mind, Wiſdom, and Love. *Unit. Tr.* vol. iv. *Tract* concerning *Emlyn*, p. 6. and Note XXII.—And in this ſenſe *Euſebius* may well be underſtood, when he complains, that the Pagans did θεοποιεῖν τὴν ἄψυχον οὐσίαν deify inanimate Nature: for theſe are the ſecond Gods, which *Athanaſius* conſiders in his book againſt the *Greeks*, *viz.* the ſeveral notions and powers of the ſupreme God deified. *Cud.* 512. 518. 531.

Mr. *Gravesend*, in his *Moses vindicatus*, p. 89. acknowledges, that "whatever is said touching the origin of Philosophy, among the *Egyptians*, the *Chaldeans*, and the *Greeks*, is a very uncertain Tradition; and his Opinion is, that it was the fruit of their Studies and Experience." Upon which Mr. *Souverain* says, "That which he advances of Philosophy in general, is still more true with regard to the particular subjects, which treat of three Principles. For by their long researches into the origin of the World, and not by Tradition, (unless it be a very uncertain and confused one) is, that they have come to the knowledge of these three principles, Goodness, Wisdom, and Power." *Le Plat. dev.* 56. And this supposition is agreable to the notions of the *Platonists* themselves; in proving the truth of their opinions from the Principle of Philosophy and Reason; which is inconsistent with the argument used by *Proclus*, to prove a divine *Cabbala*. I shall only add; that the most learned of the *Platonists* did not believe their Trinity to be the supreme God, but a Monad over them: and many of the nations, Dr. *Cudworth* mentions, held a *Duality* of a good and a bad Being. So that the notion of a Trinity was not so common, as is represented. *Unit. Treatis*, vol. iii. p. 16, 17. much less the notion of a Trinity in Unity.

XVII. p. 32. *That the Son was believed to be equal to the Father in* Essence *only.* —— *Basil* says; tho' the Son be in *Order* second to the Father, (because *produced* by him;) and in *Dignity* also, forasmuch as the Father is the Cause and Principle of his Being; yet he is not, for all that, second in *Nature*; because there is *one* Divinity in *both*. *Basil.* 3 con. *Eunom. Cudworth*, 607. —— And *Austin*, writing against the *Arians*, saith; "tho' they conceive the "*Power* of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be unequal; yet let them "for all that confess, that their *Natures* are equal at least." *Cud. ibid. Aug. con. Serm. Arian.* c. xviii. And therefore Dr. *Cudworth* says; "When *Athanasius* and the other orthodox Fathers do so frequently assert the Equality of "all the three Persons, this is to be understood in way of opposition to *Arius* "only, who made the Son to be unequal to the Father, as being ἑτερούσιος "of a different *Essence* from him." *Cud.* p. 600. The equality they mention entirely regarding the *Essence*. And in like manner he says; "When the "*Athanasians* quote the tradition of the ancient Church, and *Origen*'s testi"mony against the *Arians*, it was only to prove the Eternity and Divinity "of the Son: but not at all for such an absolute Coëquality of him with the Fa"ther, as would exclude all Dependence and Subordination, and Inferiority." For it is upon their unanimous agreement in these points, that *Petavius* taxes the Fathers with *Platonism*, and corrupting the purity of the Faith. *Cudw.* 595.

And this farther appears, not only from *Athanasius* himself, [who sometimes speaks in the stile of the ancient Fathers, that the Majesty of the Father is superior to that of the Son; and the Son is visible, the Father invisible; upon which *Dupin* observes, *mais cela n'empeche point qu'ils ne soient de meme* Nature:] (*Athanas. Orat.* 4. *con. Ar. Dupin*, p. 61. note r.) but also

alſo from the common Metaphors, by which both the *Platoniſts* and *Orthodox* explained their notions; viz. "That the ſecond *Hypoſtaſis* was derived from "the Father, as Light from the Sun, or a Stream from the Fountain." So *Lactantius* ſays, "Both the Father and Son is God, but the one, as it were, an "exuberant Fountain; the other, as a Stream derived from it: the former, like "the Sun; the latter, like a Ray extended from the Sun. *Cud.* 606. 609. *Lactant. Inſt.* lib. iv. c. xxix." And *Athanaſius* himſelf declares, that the three Perſons in the Trinity are not to be looked upon as three Principles, nor to be reſembled to three Suns, but to the Sun and its Light, and its derivative Light; "ſo, ſays he, we allow but one Principle[a]." For though he uſes the ſame Word ὁμοούσιος *(conſubſtantial)* to expreſs that the Branches are ὁμοούσιοι *(conſubſtantial)* with the Vine, and all men are *conſubſtantial* with one another, *Cud.* 606. yet he never ſuppoſes the three Perſons in the Trinity to be ſeparate, as three *Men* are, but to be inſeparably conjoined, as the Sun and its Light, ſo that one cannot exiſt without the other. All which expreſſions allow the ſame kind of Subordination, which was maintained by the *Platoniſts*. And therefore Dr. *Cudworth* ſays, "In all this "Doctrine of his *(Athanaſius)*, *viz.* that the three divine *Hypoſtaſes*, though "not *monoouſious*, but *homoouſious* only, are really but one God, or Di-"vinity; there is nothing, but what a true genuine *Platoniſt* would readily "ſubſcribe to. *Cud.* 620." And again, *Plato* expreſsly agrees and ſymbolizes, not with the "Doctrine of *Arius*, but with that of the *Nicene* Coun-"cil; nor did they differ much in Language. *Cud.* 579. 623." They both imagined the Godhead to conſiſt in the Eſſence or Subſtance, which was ſuppoſed the ſame in them all; and, where there was the ſame *generical* Subſtance, the Subſtance muſt be *equal*. And therefore *Petavius*, expounding the *Athanaſian* Creed, writeth in this manner—"The *Father* is in a right "Catholic manner affirmed by moſt of the ancients, to be *greater* than the "*Son*; and he is commonly ſaid alſo, without reprehenſion, to be *before* "him; in reſpect of Original. *Petav. de Trin.* 863. *Cudw.* 599." Whereupon He concludeth the true meaning of the Creed to be this: "That no Perſon in the Trinity is greater or leſs than other, in reſpect "of the Eſſence of the Godhead common to them all; becauſe the true "Godhead can be no where greater or leſs; for in *Identity of Kind*, there can "be no *Inequality*." *Petav.* de Trin. 863. *Cud.* 599. And Mr. *Herne*, the reputed author of the Remarks on Dr. *Waterland's* Queries, under the name of *Philalethes Cantab.* ſays, No one Text of Scripture, or Teſtimony of any ancient writer, ever declares the Son to be equal in Power or Dominion to the Father; though the contrary doctrine is frequently taught, in expreſs Terms. p. 61, 62. And to prove this, he quotes from *Tertullian*, *Novatian*, *Pierius*, *Baſil*, *Hippolytus*, *Euſebius*, &c.

[a] Cud. 599. *Athan. con. Ar. orat.* 4. p. 467.

Origen says; we affirm that the Son is not more powerful, but that he is *less* powerful than the Father: and this we affirm, out of a perſuaſion of the truth of his Words; who ſaid, the Father that ſent me is greater than I. Con. *Celſ.* lib. 8. p. 388.

Again, we ſay; that our Saviour with the Holy Ghoſt, not only comparatively but ſupereminently excells all things that were made [by him]; being yet himſelf excelled by the Father, as much, and even more, than he and the Holy Ghoſt excel the other, and theſe not ordinary [Creatures] neither; but notwithſtanding, he who excells ſuch and ſo great Beings in Eſſence and Dignity, and Power and Godhead, (for he is the diving Word and Wiſdom;) is nevertheleſs not in any thing compared to the Father. Con. *Celſ.* lib. 8. p. 388. *Novatian* ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe, and ſays; "If the Son was inviſible, if he was incomprehenſible, if he was in any other reſpect what the Father is; then we allow it might juſtly be objected, that there are two Gods; ch. xxxi. And *Euſebius* ſays; We do not ſuppoſe the two to be equal in Honour, nor that they are both of them unoriginate and unbegotten.—And Mr. *Jurieu* proves, there was no ſuch equality held by the *Antenicene* Fathers. *Emlyn*, vol. ii. p. 260. 278. 280. 284. And Mr. *Jackſon*, in his anſwer to Dr. *Waterland*, p. 351. "Nor have you produced one paſſage "of any one writer, even for the firſt 400 Years; that agreed or taught with "you, that the Son and holy Spirit were *the one ſupreme God*; or *equally ſu-* "*preme* with the Father in *Authority*, *Dominion*, and *Worſhip*."

XVIII. p. 34. *Of* Apollinaris.——Lord Chancellor *King*, the reputed Author of the Hiſtory of the Apoſtles' Creed, with critical Remarks (p. 245.) calls him the great *Apollinaris*, the ornament and ſplendor of the Church of that age, the moſt ſignalized champion for the Faith, and an illuſtrious example of Piety and Virtue—by all eſteemed the greateſt man of his age, both for Learning and Piety; a moſt accurate and nervous defender of the Faith againſt all its enemies, whether Heathens or Heretics. *Dupin* ſays; he was beloved and eſteemed by St. *Athanaſius*, St. *Baſil*, St. *Epiphanius*, and all the great Men of his age, for Learning and Knowledge. *Baſil* ſays; he has ſuch a reſpect for him, and is ſo much his Friend; that he would take *his* faults upon *himſelf*. *Epiphanius* calls him a venerable old man; and ſays, he was cheriſhed by *Athanaſius*, and all the orthodox Biſhops. St. *Jerom* ſays, that he had often ſeen him at *Antioch*; that he honoured him, and learned many things of him. *Philoſtorgius*, the *Arian* Hiſtoriographer, ſays; that he, and *Baſil*, and *Gregory Nazianzen*, defended the Divinity of Chriſt better than Any either before or after them; in compariſon of whom the great *Athanaſius* was eſteemed to be but a Child; and the moſt conſidered and eſteemed of theſe three was this *Apollinaris*: and that theſe three were wanting in nothing neceſſary to read and underſtand the Scriptures; and eſpecially this *Apollinaris*, who underſtood the *Hebrew* language. He wrote againſt the *Arians* and other Heretics; and in many volumes overthrew Hereſies, and confuted

futed Errors oppoſite to the Faith; and in thirty large and noble books moſt convincingly baffled the calumnies of *Porphyry*: and his moral character was as conſpicuous as either *Gregory*'s or *Baſil*'s. His writings ſurpaſſed in beauty and ſtrength every thing that had been written by *Euſebius*, or any of the Ancients. He was excommunicated by *George* Biſhop of *Laodicea*, the zelar Saint of the *Engliſh*; for taking the part of *Athanaſius* againſt him. But all his writings are now loſt. The Catholics, ſays *Dupin*, had ſuch a horror for the books of Heretics; that they would not even preſerve thoſe, which did not regard their Hereſy, and might be uſeful to the Church; (i. e. in plain words, they were more bigotted to Party, than ſtudious to defend Chriſtianity:) for which reaſon we have ſcarce one book of the ancient Heretics.

Is it poſſible to give a plainer proof of the blind Zele, with which the believers of thoſe times were infatuated; or a more ſufficient reaſon, why we ought not to have the worſe opinion of any of the learned of thoſe ages; merely becauſe they were condemned as Heretics? Every age has opinions peculiar to itſelf, which riſe with party zele, and fall with it again. And in the heat of theſe diſputes, the opinion of the great *Apollinaris*, founded upon a knowledge of the *Hebrew* Scriptures; when tried by a Majority of Votes in the Council of *Alexandria*, few of which, and perhaps none of them underſtood the *Hebrew* language; was condemned as heretical: becauſe he did not believe that Chriſt had a Soul and a Spirit diſtinct and different from the divine *Word* that came down from Heaven.

This Hereſy, ſays the Author of the Critical Hiſtory of the Creed, the Fathers apprehended to be attended with moſt dreadful conſequences: ſome of which he mentions, and their arguments againſt it: and it is amazing to ſee how they trifle. I ſhall lay before you the chief of them, as briefly as I can. And

Firſt, *Epiphanius* and *Athanaſius* argue; that it is impious and blaſphemous, to aſcribe *Deſire* and *Grief* to the divine Nature: and ridiculous, to aſcribe them to inſenſible Matter: therefore they muſt be aſcribed to a human Soul. I anſwer; Theſe paſſions are aſcribed in the Old Teſtament to *Jehovah*, who had no human Soul. *Jud.* x. 16, We are told of *Jehovah*, that his Soul was grieved; and *Deut.* xxxii. 29. *Jehovah* wiſhes, Oh that they were wiſe, *&c.* It is not therefore impious and blaſphemous to aſcribe Deſire and Grief to the divine Nature, in the *Old* Teſtament; why then in the *New?*

Secondly, *Vincentius Lirin.* and *Epiphanius* tell us; that if Chriſt had been void of a reaſonable Soul, i. e. beſides the *Logos*, his *Humanity* would have been defective: or he would not have been a perfect *Man*. I anſwer; According to the Scripture language, both of the Old and New Teſtament, a ſpiritual Being in a human form is a *Man*: and therefore *Angels*, without any human Souls, when they appeared in a human form, were called *Men*. For when we ſpeak of a Soul, or a human Soul, i. e. a Man's Soul; we have no other meaning to the Word, but of a ſpiritual Being inhabiting a human Body: and therefore every ſpiritual Being, while it inhabits a human

Body, is the Soul of it; however perfect or imperfect: and no other Soul can be wanting, to make it a perfect Man: and it was in this sense the *Cabbalists* believed the Angel *Metatron*, the instructer of *Moses*, to be the Soul of the *Messias*.

Thirdly, *Clemens Romanus* says; He (*Christ*) gave his Flesh for our Flesh, and his Soul for our Soul: But *Clemens Romanus* could not mean this, as an objection to the opinion of *Apollinaris*: for he lived long before him. And *Athanasius* says; that the Body is given for the Body; and the Soul for the Soul. And that one thing cannot be redeemed by another, that is different therefrom. And *Theodoret* says, If God the Word did not assume the human Soul, he could neither relieve it nor honour it. But where do we find any of these pretty Fancies in the Scripture? They are nothing but mere Conjectures; and, if they were true, the consequence would be, that the Divinity of Christ had nothing at all to do in our Redemption; but the Body of Christ redeemed the Body of Man; and the Soul, the Soul. But if the Divinity be considered under the general notion of a Spirit; then, even according to these Doctrines, there could be no need of any other Spirit; the Divine Nature supplying the want of it. For *Vinc. Lirinensis* tells us; that, according to the *Apollinarian* notion, ἀρκέσαι τὴν θείαν φύσιν εἰς τὸ πληρῶσαι τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς χρέος, the Divine Nature supplied the want of a Soul: and as to the Redemption *of* the Body; the text which speaks of it is interpreted by some in a very different manner, *viz. from* the Body. (See Dr. *Sykes* on Redemption.)

But, Fourthly, the chief Argument which they trusted to was this; that Christ descended into *Hell*. (*Ps.* xvi. 10. For thou wilt not leave my *Soul* in *Hell*; neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see Corruption: quoted *Acts* ii. 27. and xiii. 35.) and that could not be his *Deity*; because that is omnipresent, and was in *Hell* before, as well as elsewhere; and could not make a local transition thither.—'Tis manifest, this argument proves equally against the descent of the *Logos* from *Heaven*; as against his descent into *Hell*.

However, 'tis probable; that all these arguments were answered by the *Apollinarists*: for it was thought better afterwards to argue, "That the Godhead "did descend into *Hell*, accompanying his Soul thither; and from thence de- "livered the captive Souls, broke the sting of Death, rent in sunder those "bars and adamantine chains; and by his power loosened the bands of "*Hell*, not suffering his Flesh to see Corruption; (*Epiph.* adv. Hær. lib. 3. "Compend. Fid. Cath. p. 463 & 465.) and at his sight the Porters of "*Hell* trembled. (See the Confession of the *Arians* at *Ariminum*, ap. "*Socr.* Hist. lib. ii. ch. xxvii. p. 133.)"

Upon this a very serious and orthodox writer says; When I read the place in *Job*, out of the LXX (*Job* xxxviii. 17.) Ἀνοίγονται δέ σοι φόβῳ πυλαὶ θανάτου· πυλωροὶ δὲ ᾅδου ἰδόντες σε ἔπτηξαν· and *these* expressions in the old Symbols or Creeds; I hear methinks *Virgil* speaking of *Hercules*, and saying,

saying, *Te Stygii tremuere lacus, Te janitor Orci*—" Hun, let the Original of " that opinion be what it will; it is certain, that the New Testament has " not a Word about it in the Gospels."

To this argument of the Fathers it may be answered; If the Divinity of Christ could accompany his Soul into *Hell*, it might certainly go thither by itself.—But in truth, the word *Hell*, which they build upon, in this text means only the Grave; and respects particularly neither Soul nor Body; but means a person either dead or alive. See Note XXX. and *Pearson*, p. 232; and the sense of the words is only this, that Christ should not be left in the *Grave*; but rise again before the putrefaction of the Body.

You see by this, how little danger there was in the opinion of *Apollinaris*; and how little the Fathers had to say against it. And therefore it is no wonder, that a Doctrine, so agreable to Scripture and Reason, continued among the Christians in after-times, and appeared in different shapes; and particularly among the *Monothelites*: whose Heresy, as it is called, in believing that Christ had but one *Will*, was a natural consequence of believing him to be one *Person*; in whom the *Logos* supplied the place of the human Soul; one *Spirit* being sufficient for one *Person*. And though this opinion was also condemned in the sixth general Council of *Constantinople* (in 680); and they who held it were banished from that city, in consequence of this condemnation; yet it could not be much to their dishonour, if it be considered, that the *Roman* Bishops, who condemned them, were so shamefully ignorant, that the Pope himself wrote to the Emperor " to excuse their ignorance of " the languages and of the holy Scriptures; and tells him, he was forced to " send to *England* for a Divine; having no Person in *Italy* fit to appear in " that Quality at the Council. And this is written not only in behalf of his " own Legates, but of the Deputies of the Synod. If this ignorance prevaled " to so high a degree among the Clergy at *Rome*; in what a darkness must " the common people be involved! and yet such as these, says the histo- " rian, have been chosen to decide the most important controversies relat- " ing to the Salvation of Mankind; who were implicitly obliged to submit " to their decisions. *Echard's* Rom. Hist. vol. iv. p. 333."

XIX. p. 35. *Bernard Gilpin*, kinsman to Bishop *Tonstal*, says of him; *Memini* Tonstallum *episcopum sæpe narrasse*, Innocentium *tertium* inconsulte fecisse; *quod* Transubstantiationis *opinionem articulum fidei fecisset*. Vit. Bern. Gilp. p. 40. and again: *Illud etiam idem* Tonstallus *ex scriptis & sermonibus affirmare solebat*; Innocentium *tertium nescisse quid ageret, quando* Transubstantiationem *inter articulos fidei posuerit: dicebatque*, Innocentium *doctis hominibus circa se caruisse*. p. 46.

XX. p. 35. This fourth *Lateran* Council, called by the *Romanists* the twelv'th general Council, was more truely *general*, than almost any of those that were so called. There were present 1200 Fathers; the Ambassadors of the Emperor

Emperor of *Conſtantinople*, the King of the *Romans*, the Kings of *France*, *Arragon*, *England*, *Hungary*, *Jeruſalem*, *Cyprus*, and diverſe others; alſo the five *Patriarchs*, partly in perſon and partly by their legates; viz. of *Rome*, *Conſtantinople*, *Jeruſalem*, *Antioch*, and *Alexandria*.

See Note 94 on *Joachim*'s doctrine in *Mosheim*'s *Cudworth*, p. 727. [*Lateranenſi.*] *Concilium ſine dubio intelligit* Lateranenſe 14 *generale*, *quod* auſpiciis Innocentii III. A. MCCXV. *cœtum eſt*. *Acta extant apud* Jo. Harduinum Concilior. tom. iii. p. 1. *Abbas* Joachimus *tunc temporis ſimile quid ejus de cæteris erat*, *quod gaudeo ante* Cudworthus *nemullos antiquorum Theologorum docuiſſe refert*; unitatem *nimirum* Eſſentiæ trium perſonarum veram eſſe ſimplicem ac realem *negaverat*; *contra*, unitatem tantum concordiæ *in Deo eſſe aſſeveraverat*; *ſicut* multi homines, unus populus, *et* multi fideles, una Eccleſia *dicuntur*. *V.* Natalis Alexander, Hiſtoriæ Eccleſ. ſæc. xiii. cap. iii. art. iii. p. 77. et diſſ. 12. ad ſæc. xiii. p. 331. *Hunc quo retunderet errorem* Lateranenſe *concilium primo decreto ſic ſtatim ſanxit*: *Firmiter credimus*, *& ſimpliciter confitemur*; *quod unus ſolus eſt verus Deus*,—*Pater & Filius & Sp. S. tres quidem perſonæ*, *ſed una eſſentia*, *ſubſtantia*, *ſeu natura ſimplex omnino. Et lege ſecunda iidem antiſtites hoc modo determinant. Nos autem, ſacro et univerſali concilio approbante, credimus & confitemur cum* Petro; *quod una quædam ſumma res eſt*, *incomprehenſibilis quidem et ineffabilis*, *quæ veraciter eſt Pater*, *Filius & Sp. S. tres ſimul Perſonæ ac ſingularis quælibet earundem. Et ideo in Deo Trinitas eſt ſolummodo*, *non Quaternitas*; *quia quælibet trium Perſonarum eſt illa res*, *viz. Subſtantia*, *Eſſentia*, *ſeu Divina Natura*, *quæ ſola eſt Univerſorum Principium*; *præter quod aliud inveniri non poteſt*.

XXI. p. 35. The different Trinities mentioned by Biſhop *Stillingfleet*, from the *Unitarian* Tracts, are theſe—

Firſt, The *Ciceronian* Trinity; ſo called, becauſe *Cicero* had uſed the word *Perſonæ* for different reſpects; *ſuſtineo tres Perſonas*: and, according to this acceptation, three Perſons are no more than three Relations, Capacities, or Reſpects of God to his Creatures: which, the objectors ſay, is downright *Sabellianiſm*.

Second, The *Carteſian* Trinity; which maketh three divine Perſons, or three infinite Minds, Spirits, or Beings, to be one God. This is objected to, as being either a God, compounded of three Perſons; or elſe three Gods.

Third, The *Platonic* Trinity, of three divine cō-eternal Perſons; whereof the ſecond and third are ſubordinate and inferior to the firſt, in Dignity, Power, and all other Qualities, except only Duration. This is objected-to, as being *Arianiſm*.

Fourth, The *Ariſtotelian* Trinity; which ſaith, the divine Perſons are one God; becauſe they have one and the ſame *numerical* Subſtance. This is objected-to, as deſtroying the Perſonality of the Son and Holy Ghoſt; and as never held in the Church, till the year 1215.

Fifth,

Fifth, The Trinity of the *Mobile*; which is held by the common People, or by such lazy Divines, as only say in short, that it is an inconceivable Mystery; and that those are as much in fault, who go about to explane it; as those who oppose it. *Stilling fleet*'s Def. of the Trin. Pref. p. 5. *Bennet*'s Iren. p. 79.

XXII. p. 36. *The Trinity of St. Austine, and the reformed Churches abroad.* From the Unitarian Tracts, vol. iv. Tract. 7. p. 24. and p. 4. *ibid.* —— A divine Person is the divine Essence particularly considered with, and distinguished by, an essential Property. The Property, which according to the order of Nature obtains the first rank in the consideration of Deity, is *infinite and perfect Intelligence*. God then, considered as an eternal self existing, self-living, and all perfect Intelligence, is the *Father*, or first *Person* of the Trinity.

Now it is the Nature of a perfect intelligent Understanding *to reflect*; and by this reflection of the Intellect is produced a Wisdom, commensurate to the Understanding whence it is derived. And so this Wisdom manifestly is the offspring of the Mind. God [i. e. the same singular Essence] considered with this God-like Property, is called the *Son*; and second *Person*.

In fine, the two aforesaid divine Properties naturally produce the divine Will or Love; by which God loves his infinite Perfections. And the divine Essence considered with this Property, is the *Spirit*; and third *Person*.

This is St. *Austine*'s explication; and thus the *Persons* are particularly explained by the reformed Churches abroad. See the Confession of Faith of the Protestant *Gallican* Church, Art. 6. and *Calvin*'s Catechisms, Sunday the third; and his Institut. l. i. c. xiii. § 18. where he says, *Mens unius essentiæ se ipsam inclinat; ut primo* Deum *consideret, deinde emergentem ex eo* Sapientiam, *tum postremo* Virtutem *qua consilii sui decreta exequitur.* And according to this are the *modal* distinctions, by which Divines do usually explane the Trinity; *viz.* Life, Understanding, and Will; and St. *Austine*'s Trinity, of Mind, Wisdom, and Love. Unit. Tr. vol. iv. Tr. 8. p. 6. Compare this with the Notions of the *Platonists*, Note xvi. p. 113. —— Now, by this way of arguing, every Man is a *Trinity* of himself: for he has the immaterial *Essence*, with the Property of *Intelligence*; and he can reflect, and produce a *Wisdom*, commensurate to the Understanding, whence it is derived: and these two Properties may produce the human *Will*, or *Love*; by which Man loves his own finite Perfections. ——But will a man pretend, that these are three real Persons? Will he imagine it possible, that the second of these Persons should suffer and die? Can Wisdom suffer? All this is nothing, at the bottom; but what Dr. *Cudworth* would call *Sabellian Jargony*. It is μία ὑπόστασις τρισπρόσωπος, and ἐν τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ. In the same stile the *French* Confession says; the Father is the Cause of all, the Son is his Wisdom and Word, the Holy Spirit his Virtue and Power. So the *Belgic*. And the *Polish* says, We call the Father God; who begat his only begotten Son, by

whom from Eternity he foreknew all things. So the Son is represented as the Father's Intellect. *Euseb.* vol. ii. p. 225.

XXIII. p. 39. The Bishops chiefly concerned in this wrangle, were *Eusebius Pamphili*, and *Eustathius* of *Antioch*; *dum ille Eustathio suisque* ὁμοδόξοις *asserentibus Montanismum & Sabellianismum exprobrarent; hi vero istis Ethnicorum* πολυθεΐαν *objicerent.* Bulli Op. 31. falsely printed 28.

XXIV. p. 45. *From* Chillingworth.——I desire you to vindicate from Contradiction the following Assertions: that there should be length, and nothing long; breadth, and nothing broad; thickness, and nothing thick. *&c.* that is, that there should be a long, broad, thick, white, round, heavy, sweet, moist, flowing, active, passive *Nothing. Rel. of Prot.* ch. v. § 46.

XXV. p. 51. *Hilary de Trin.* lib. 10.——*Homo ille de Deo ortus, habens ad* patiendum *quidem Corpus, sed Naturam non habens ad* dolendum——*In quem quamvis ictus incideret, aut vulnus descenderet, &c. afferrent quidem hæc* impetum *passionis, sed non* dolorem *passionis inferrent.*

This Man is from God, having a Body capable of suffering, but not a Nature to feel pain.——On whom, though Blows might fall, *&c.* they brought the Violence of Passion, but not the Pain of it. As when a Sword is thrust through the Water, *&c.* He repetes the same, in several places; as in his Comment on *Ps.* liii. The Passion of Christ was undergone by Him voluntarily; to make an Acknowledgement, that Pain was due; not that He who suffered was at all touched by this; *non tamen patiebatur sensu doloris patientiæ.* and on *Ps.* cxxxviii. Christ is thought to have felt Pain, because he suffered; but he was really free from all Pain, because he is God. Do but think now, says *Daillé*, whereunto all this tendeth: and what will become of our Salvation, if the Passion of our Saviour Christ, which is the only foundation whereon it is built, were but a mere imaginary Passion; without any sense of Pain at all. (*Usf of the Fathers*, Part 2. p. 80.) The more modern System is, that *God* suffered; but not in his own Nature. But *Justin Martyr*, p. 25. who had not learned to deny the Suffering of that Son of God, who descended from Heaven; tells us the true Scripture Doctrine —— That he sweat, as it were, great drops of Blood; praying that the Cup might pass from him, *cum videlicet trepidaret cor ejus & ossa similiter, &c. ut sciremus Patrem in omnibus perpessionibus filium suum tunc nostræ causa versari voluisse; & non dicturum, illum, quod Dei filius esset, non sensisse ea quæ illi allata sunt & audierunt.* Lond. edit. p. 361. 362.

XXVI. p. 54. *Ignatius*, in his Epist. to the *Philadelphians*, says:—— εἰ δέ τις τοῦτο μὲν ὁμολογῇ, καὶ ὅτι Θεὸς Λόγος ἐν ἀνθρωπίνῳ σώματι ἦν τοῦτο, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ Λόγος ἀϊδὴς ἐν σώματι, διὰ τὸ ἕνωσιν εἶναι Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀνθρωπείαν ψυχήν.

The opinion of *Apollinaris*, according to *Auſtin*, was; that Chriſt aſſumed *Fleſh*, without a *Soul*. *Har.* 55. p. 182.—That he had not a human or rational Soul; as *Caſſian* words it: that, inſtead of it, the Divinity ſupplied its place and room. He believed, that Chriſt had an *animal Spirit*; but not a *rational Soul*: and the *Arians* believed, he had *neither*. See *Facund.* l. ix. c. 3. *Pearſon* on the Creed, 238. Crit. Hiſt. of the Apoſtle's Creed, 245.

Theodoret ſays, Ἀρεῖος δὲ Εὐνόμιος—ἔφασαν—τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον τῆς ψυχῆς ἐνηργηκέναι τὴν χρείαν. Divin. Dec. Epiſt. c. 12. p. 124. and *Athanaſius* ſays of *Arius*, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν ἡμῖν ἀνθρώπου νῦν ἐνηργηκέναι ἐν Χριστῷ. Tom. i. de Incar. Chriſti, adv. Apol. p. 628. See *Dupin* Nouv. Bibl. Vol. ii. 125.

Eunomius ſays of Chriſt; ἀναλαβόντα τὸν ἐξ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ἄνθρωπον. That he took on him Man, conſiſting of Soul and Body. *Fabric.* Bib. *Græ.* Vol. viii. p. 257. But we are referred to a Note in p. 250, and told; that this muſt be underſtood, according to the Hereſy of *Apollinaris*; that by ψυχὴ we are not to underſtand *Mens*, but the inferior *Anima*, conſiſting in the Senſes; which learned Men may talk of as they pleaſe, but know nothing of it; or whether there be any ſuch thing.

XXVII. p. 56. *Quinam ſunt enim illi, qui nobis Biblica volumina ſarta tecta ſervavere; niſi* Judæi? *quot mendis Scriptionis in ſacrum codicem irrepſiſſent; ſi illius cuſtodia ſolis* Lactantiis, Auguſtinis, Gregoriis, Chryſoſtomis, *viris ſanctiſſimis, ſed imperitis* Hebraiſmi, *mandata fuiſſet? inter* Græcos *omnes* Latinosque *qui veterem eccleſiam revere, unus* Origenes *cum* Hieronymo *Hebraice ſcivit; & ferme nimium dixi, ne elementa quidem didicerat.* Cunæus *de Rep.* Hebr. p. 117.

XXVIII. p. 56. *Hic Deus* unus *eſt, non duo aut plures duobus, ſed unicus; cujus* Unitas *non eſt ſimilis individuis, quæ reperiuntur in mundo: nec unus eſt* Specie, *complectente plura individua: neque unus* Corpore, *quod eſt diviſibile in partes atque extrema; ſed ita unus eſt, ut nulla unitas ſimilis iſti in mundo reperiatur.* Maimon. de Fundam. Leg. § 4.

XXIX. p. 33. *Of the* Athanaſian *Creed, which Dr.* Whitby *calls the* Pſeudo-athanaſian *Creed.*——Dr. *Cudworth* ſays; "As to that Creed, which is commonly called *Athanaſian*; which was written a long time after [*Athanaſius*], by ſome other Hand; ſince at firſt it derived all its Authority, either from the name of *Athanaſius*, from whom it is entitled; or elſe becauſe it was ſuppoſed to be an Epitome and Abridgement of his Doctrine; this I conceive is therefore to be interpreted, according to the Tenor of that Doctrine contained in the genuine writings of *Athanaſius*. *Intel. Syſ.* p. 620." The Author of the Creed is unknown; and what Language it was written in. See *Cave's* Hiſt. Lit. 146; and the diſcourſe of the *Benedictines* on it, in their Edition of the Works of *Athan.* Tom. ii. p. 719. Archbiſhop *Tillotſon* wiſhes the Church was well rid of it. It is written upon the principles

of *Cyril*, and not on those of *Athanasius*; for it speaks of the three Persons existing separately, as God and Lord: whereas the Doctrine of *Athanasius* considered them as inseparately conjoined. And Dr. *Waterland*, who is looked upon to be orthodox by many, absolutely contradicts it. For the Creed says, "We are compelled by the Christian Verity, to acknowledge every "Person by himself to be God and Lord;" but Dr. *Waterland* says, *No One* Person is one God; exclusively of the *other Two*." *Defence* of his Quer. 349. *Jackson*, 438.

And it is drawn according to a Maxim of the *Platonists*; which, we are told by *Le Clerc*, the Fathers used to imitate; *viz.* that they used contrary and opposite Terms, when speaking of the same thing; asserting it in one sense, and denying it in another. *Bib. Univ. & Hist.* Vol. ii. p. 214. Χρῆται γὰρ τοῖς ἐναντίοις φαινόμενα καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τὸ γὰρ ὂν αἰσθητὸν ἅμα καὶ νοητὸν, ἅμα μὲν ὄν, says *Diog. Laert.* of *Plato*; ἅμα δὲ οὐκ ὄν, ἅμα τὸ γίνεσθαι αὐτὸ καὶ μηδέποτε εἶναι, διὰ τὴν συνεχῆ μεταβολήν. The objects of Sense both are, and are not; they are, because they are made; they are not, because of their continual change. *Le Clerc* instances as follows; "*c'est ainsi que nous disons, qu'il n'y a que* Jesus Christ *qui soit mediateur; sans en exclure neantmoins les ministres ordinaires qui le sont aussi.*" The Word being applied to them, in a less excellent and proper sense; which properly and in the strict sense could only be applied to Christ. There are many instances of this manner of writing, in Mr. *Ralph Venner's* Orthodox Paradoxes; published in 1650: *Ex. gr.* "a Believer believes, that the Father is not the Son; and yet, that whatever the Father is, the Son is the same—He believes, that God hath no Form; and yet, that Christ appeared in the Form of God—He believes, that God will not acquit the wicked; and yet, that God justifies the ungodly." And indeed, I think, no one scruples to speak in this manner: for it is nothing more than asserting a thing in a lax Sense, and denying it in a stricter one. Thus *Luke* ix. 18. And it came to pass, as he was *alone* praying, that his Disciples were with him. Here, in the lax sense of the Word *alone*, as it signifies apart from the multitude, the Proposition is true; but in the strict sense of it, as it signifies *by one's self*, it is a direct contradiction. Now all such Propositions may be either asserted or denied, according to the sense they are taken in; or asserted in one sense, and denied in the other. Thus we find it asserted, *Mark* xii. 29. 32. that there is but one Lord; and in *Hosea*, xii. 4. There is no God but Me; and no Saviour besides Me: and yet in the same chapter of St. *Mark*, the Apostle makes no scruple of mentioning an other Lord, verse 36; the Lord said unto my Lord: and St. *Thomas* confesses an other Person to be his Lord and his God; and St. *Paul* tells us of an other who is the Saviour; *Tit.* iii. 4. 6. Now why should not all these seeming contradictions be explaned in the same manner?

And thus, though there is but one God, in the sense of the Word *Jehovah*, the self-existent God; yet the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost may be all of them called so, in the larger sense of the word *Elohim* or *Adonai*:

and

and yet it may be as improper to say, they are three Gods, or a Trinity of Gods; as to say there are two Lords, or two Saviours. In like manner, it is proper to say; that *Jehovah* is God, and *Moses* was a God to *Pharaoh:* yet by no means proper to say, that *Jehovah* and *Moses* were two Gods: because the Word *God*, in the two Propositions, is not to be understood in the same sense. And it is upon this account that *Tertullian* says; "Though "he might call the Son *God*, speaking of him *alone*; yet speaking of him "with the Father, he would not name him so at the same time with Him; "but would call only the Father *God*, and the Son *Lord*." *Contr.* Prax. c. 13. *Bull* 252. And this is the Sense, in which *Philo* calls the *Logos* a second God: in which he was followed by some of the Christian Fathers. But they did not mean, that he was a second self-existent Being; but used the word *God* of a Being, whom they allowed to be originate and begotten. And it does not appear, that Dr. *Cudworth* could have any other reason than this for telling us; that "though it be allowable to speak of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, each of them as *God*; yet is it not allowable to speak of a Trinity of Gods: or what other reason St. *Austine* could have, as the foundation of *his* remark; that the *Philosophers* used free language, but *Christians* are tied-up to phrases on this occasion; and ought to speak by a certain Rule." *Cud.* 550. 'Tis true, these things are so: but what is this Rule? and how came it to pass, that one of these ways of speaking is allowable; and the other not? If the Words have the same Meaning, why should not the Christians have the liberty of confessing their Belief in any Words that will express their Thoughts? and if no reason can be given, it looks as if the Christians allowed *three* Gods in *Fact*; but did not dare to say so. And there is no wonder, that *Mahomet* and the *Moors* understood it so. But this is not the Case: they believe but *one* God. And therefore, though these learned men give no reason for it, there must be a reason; and the different sense of the Word *God*, as it is used in Scripture, supplies us with a very plane one; and completely answers the Difficulty. In any other sense, the Propositions of the Creed are absolute Contradictions; as will appear by what follows. Mr. *Tho. Bennet*, in a Book called *a Confutation of Popery*, has endeavoured to get clear of this Objection. He says; "If Re-"velation should say, that *Three are One*; in the same respect that Reason "says, that *Three are not One*; then Reason and Revelation would certainly "contradict each other. But this we do not find: for Revelation says, that "Three *Persons* are One, in *Essence*"; [not that Revelation ever does say so; but this Mr. *Bennet* assumes to be the case, in order to make good his argument:] and "Reason says, that Three *Persons* are not One, in *Person*; and "therefore the several Dictates of Reason and Revelation are very consistent "with each other—because it is no contradiction to say, that the same thing "may be *Three*, in one respect; and *One*, in another." p. 149.—This answer is very far from reaching the difficulty. It is allowed; that the same thing

thing may be Three in one reſpect, and One in another. *e. g.* Three Men may be one Company; three Lines one Triangle; three Rooms one Houſe; but this is only calling the Parts by one name, and the Whole by another: The difficulty of the *Pſeudo-athanaſian* Doctrine is very different; (for the Son and Holy Spirit are not parts of God:) *viz.* How three Perſons, each of them *ſingly* ſupreme God, ſhall be *altogether* but one ſupreme God. This is not like ſaying, three Men are one Company, *&c.* but it is a direct aſſertion, that Three are One; in *the ſame*, and not in *a different* reſpect, as Mr. *Bennet* ſuggeſts; *viz.* That three Lines are one Line, three Men one Man, and three Gods one God: which is a contradiction in *Terms*, as well as in *Nature*; and in every Senſe, except the Word *ſupreme* be omitted; and the Word *God* be underſtood, as it is uſed in Scripture, ſometimes to ſignify *Jehovah*, and ſometimes *Elohim*; and in this Senſe, the Words of the *Athanaſian* Creed are ſcriptural and conſiſtent. But the *Pſeudo-athanaſian* Doctrine can be true in no ſenſe at all.

XXX. p. 68. The *Hebrew* word נֶפֶשׁ, as well as the *Greek* ψυχὴ, are ſtill more indeterminate; as appears from *Numb.* vi. 6. He ſhall come at no dead *Body*; which literally tranſlated by *Ainſworth*, is, "He ſhall not come "at a dead *Soul*."—So *Levit.* xix. 28. xxi. 11. xxii. 4. *Numb.* v. 2. what is tranſlated the dead or the dead *Body*, is, in the original, *Soul*. So *Hag.* xi. 13. what the LXX. call ἀκάθαρτος ἐπὶ ψυχῇ is rightly tranſlated, one that is unclean by a dead *Body*. Though in other places נֶפֶשׁ ſignify the *Soul*, yet in theſe it muſt be taken for *Body*. *Pearſon*, p. 232. where this is more fully conſidered. In like manner, though the word *Chriſt* ſhould ſometimes mean a compound Being, God and Man; yet when we ſpeak of his *Suffering*, it muſt be conſidered in a more determinate manner; whether *both* God and Man ſuffered; or whether it was only *one* of them; and *which* of the two; the Being or Part who was capable of ſuffering, or the Being who was incapable.

XXXI. p. 73. *Of the* Unity.——The following, I think, are all the expreſſions in the New Teſtament; which ſeem to aſſert a Unity between God and Chriſt: and all of them agree in a *figurative* Unity, *i. e.* a Unity of *Will* and *Teſtimony*, &c. as explained by *Calvin* on *John* x. 30. and *Beza* on 1 *John* v. 7. Unit. Tr. vol iv. *Emlyn* Humble Enquiry, p. 47. *&c.* but cannot poſſibly all of them relate to *Perſon* or *Subſtance*. Firſt, 1 *Jo.* v. 7. 8. It is ſaid; theſe three, *viz.* Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are *One* (ΕΝ, one *thing*.) Now, ſuppoſing this Text to be *genuine*, the Meaning is; that they are *One* in *Teſtimony*; for to this purpoſe they are ſpoken of; and not in regard of *Subſtance* or *Perſon*: Not Unity of *Subſtance*; for then the Word Οὐσία, or *Hypoſtaſis*, or ſome other word ſignifying *Subſtance*, would have been expreſſed: and not *Perſon*; for then it would not have been ΕΝ, but ΕΙΣ. But

moſt

moſt probably the text is *ſpurious*. See Sir *Iſaac Newton*'s Letter to Mr. *Le Clerc*.

Second, *Jo.* xvii. 21. Chriſt prays, that the Diſciples may be ΕΝ, one *Thing*: and this Unity is ſo explained in the context, as can only mean a *figurative* Unity; or a Unity of *Will*, *Conſent*, *Glory*, &c.; and not of *Subſtance* or *Perſon*. "Neither pray I for Theſe alone; but for Them alſo, which ſhall believe on Me through Their Word: that They all may be *one*, (ἓν, one *Thing*; not one *Subſtance*;) as Thou Father art in Me, and I in Thee: that They alſo may be *one* [ἓν] with Us; that the World may believe, that Thou haſt ſent Me. And the Glory, which Thou gaveſt Me, have I given Them; that They may be *one* [ἓν], even as We are *one* [ἓν.] I in them, and Thou in Me; that They may be made perfect in *one* (thing, εἰς ἓν) that the World may know, Thou haſt ſent Me; and haſt loved Them, as Thou haſt loved Me.

Third, *Jo.* x. 30. I and my Father are *one* [ἓν, one *thing*]. This means an Agreement in *Power*, *Will*, and *Conſent*. So *Rom.* xii. 5. We are *one* Body in Chriſt; and *Rom.* xvi. 6.; that ye may with *one* Mind and *one* Mouth glorify God; and 1 *Cor.* iii. 6. 8. He that planteth and he that watereth are *one* (ἓν, one thing); i. e. in *Conſent*, *Teſtimony*, and *Will*. So ch. x. 17. *One* Body; and *Eph.* ii. 14. He is our Peace, who hath made both (*i. e.* Jews and Gentiles) ἓν, *one thing*. And ἵνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον' *one* new Man. Verſe 15.

Now nothing can be more plane through the whole Goſpel, than the perfect Unity between God and Chriſt in carrying on the ſame deſign in the ſame manner; in order to unite all Good Men in the ſame Unity of deſign: that they may be partakers of the divine Nature, θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως. II *Pet.* i. 4. So that God and Chriſt are *one*, ἓν, one Thing; in the very ſame ſenſe in which Chriſt prays that his Diſciples may be ἓν, one Thing: which is not capable of being underſtood either of Subſtance or Perſon, and muſt be underſtood of Will, or Deſign, or Glory.

And therefore *Juſtin Martyr*, in his Dialogue with *Trypho*, ſays; the Perſon who appeared to *Abraham* and *Jacob* and *Moſes*, and is ſtiled *God*; is another Perſon diſtinct from the God who is the Maker of all things: diſtinct, I ſay, in *Number*; but not diſagreeing in *Will*: for I affirm, that he never did any thing; but what it was the Will of the Maker of the Univerſe (above whom there is no other God) that he ſhould do and ſay——And *Origen* ſays, the Father and Son are two in Subſtance; [τῇ ὑποστάσει] but in Concord, Agreement, and Sameneſs of Will, they are one. Contr. *Celſ.* 386. And again; If any one, ſays he, ſhould be afraid; leaſt we ſhould go over to the opinion of thoſe, who deny the Father and the Son to be *two* diſtinct Subſtances; [for that was *Heterodoxy* in his Days, which is looked upon to be *Orthodoxy* now:] let him conſider that text, "All that believed were of *one* Heart and "of *one* Soul:" and then he will perceive the meaning of this; "I and "my Father are *one*."

In

In short, the whole design and end of Christianity is to complete the Unity between God and Man, that is here spoken of: that all Christians may be *one* with Christ and God, even as They are one; that they may learn to act upon the same Principles of Love and Benevolence and Equity; and pursue the Perfection and Happiness of the Universe, and of every Individual, by the practise of Righteousness: and so come to partake of the Divine Nature, and become Sons of God. For the Sum of all Perfection consists in Unity of Will and Design with God, who is infinitely wise and just, and good. How the Unity of God was explained by the Ancients, see in Dr. *Whitby*'s last Thoughts; p. 63 to 68.

END OF THE NOTES, &c. ON THE FIRST LETTER.